REPORT RESUMES

ED 013 685 24 RC 001 725

A PILOT STUDY TO DETERMINE THE INFLUENCE UPON TEACHERS AND UPON STUDENTS OF A TELEVISION PROGRAM DESIGNED TO PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING AND CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION IN SPANISH.

BY- HOWE, ELLIOT C.
UTAH STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION, SALT LAKE CITY,UTAH

REPORT NUMBER CRP-467 PUB DATE DEC 66
REPORT NUMBER BR-5-8390
EDRS PRICE MF-$0.50 HC-$3.48 87P.

DESCRIPTORS- *SPANISH, *LANGUAGE INSTRUCTION, *INSERVICE TEACHER EDUCATION, *TELEVISED INSTRUCTION, FOREIGN LANGUAGE FILMS, EDUCATIONAL TELEVISION, TELEVISION TEACHERS, INSERVICE PROGRAMS, TEACHING METHODS,

THREE SMALL SCHOOLS IN UTAH, INCLUDING THREE TEACHERS AND THEIR SPANISH I STUDENTS, PARTICIPATED IN THIS STUDY. ONE TEACHER RECEIVED CONVENTIONAL IN-SERVICE TRAINING, THE OTHER TWO WERE GIVEN IN IN-SERVICE TRAINING IN TEACHING SPANISH AS THEY OBSERVED THE TELEVISION CLASS. ONE GROUP OF STUDENTS OBSERVED THE TELEVISION CLASS THREE TIMES PER WEEK FOR THIRTY MINUTES AS THEIR TEACHER OBSERVED THE PROGRAM. FEW, IF ANY, CONCLUSIONS CAN BE MADE ON THE BASIS OF THIS PILOT STUDY BECAUSE OF UNFORSEEN EVENTS THAT INVALIDATED THE BASIC PREMISES OF THE INVESTIGATION. THE MAJOR FACTORS IN REGARD TO THIS FAILURE WERE SEEN AS--(1) MALFUNCTION OF THE SUBSTATIONS, (2) FAILURE TO GET THE ANTENNA OPERATING AT ONE SCHOOL, AND (3) REFUSAL OF ONE TEACHER TO COOPERATE WITH THE PROJECT AFTER ABOUT TWO MONTHS. (SF)

ED013685

BR-5-8390
PA-24

A PILOT STUDY TO DETERMINE THE INFLUENCE UPON TEACHERS AND UPON STUDENTS OF A TELEVISION PROGRAM DESIGNED TO PROVIDE IN-SERVICE TRAINING AND CLASSROOM INSTRUCTION IN SPANISH

RECEIVED
OCT 5 1967
NMSU
E.R.I.C.

The research reported herein was supported by the
Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education,
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.
Project #467

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Salt Lake City, Utah
December 1966

AC 001 725

A Pilot Study to Determine the Influence Upon Teachers and Upon Students of a Television Program Designed to Provide In-Service Training and Classroom Instruction in Spanish

Cooperative Research Project No. 467

Principal Investigator
Dr. Elliot C. Howe
Specialist, Foreign Language Education
Division of Elementary and Secondary Education
Utah State Board of Education

Contractor:
Board of Education, Garfield County School District, Panguitch, Utah
Dr. Vermon Barney, Superintendent

The research reported herein was supported by the
Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education,
U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Salt Lake City, Utah
December 1966

FOREWORD

This research was completed under the auspices of the Garfield County School District, Dr. Vermon Barney, Superintendent. Other districts which cooperated were the Sevier School District, Mr. LaMont L. Bennett, Superintendent, and the Kane School District, Mr. Doyle K. Swallow, Superintendent. Appreciation is expressed to the foreign language teachers, their students, and the principals of Kanab High School, South Sevier High School, and Bryce Valley High School.

Assignments in the project were accepted by the following people:

Project Directors	Dr. T. H. Bell State Superintendent of Public Instruction Dr. Vermon Barney Superintendent, Garfield County School District
Principal Investigator	Dr. Elliot C. Howe Specialist in Foreign Language Education, Utah State Board of Education
Language Specialist and Project Consultant	Mrs. Helia Araujo de Box Specialist in Spanish Language, Fulbright Fellow from Mexico
Television Teacher	Mr. Eugene K. Amundsen Spanish Teacher, South Davis Junior High School
Statisticians	Mr. Robert Toronto Graduate Student, University of Utah Dr. Oakley J. Gordon Professor of Psychology, University of Utah
Special Assistant	Mr. Edward Campos Spanish Teacher, Granger High School

Test Schools	Teachers
Davis High, Kaysville, Utah	Harold G. Olmstead
Provo High, Provo, Utah	Paul Lloyd
Wayne County High, Bicknell, Utah	Merlin D. Waite

Evaluators of Speaking Tests	
	Dr. Ernest L. Wilkins Professor of Spanish Literature Brigham Young University Provo, Utah
	Dr. Grant Rees Professor of Spanish Utah State University Logan, Utah
	Professor Gary L. Haws Professor of Spanish Weber State College Ogden, Utah

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Foreword ii

I. Introduction 1

II. The Problem. 3

III. Procedures 7

IV. The Data 13

V. Observations and Suggestions 35

Appendix A: Tests Written for the Pilot Study 41

Appendix B: Miscellaneous Materials Pertaining to the Pilot Study 63

Bibliography 85

I. INTRODUCTION

It is often necessary for teachers in small high schools to teach several subjects without having sufficient training either in subject matter or in methods of instructing the specific course which they are assigned to teach. Communities which are remote from population centers present unique problems for in-service training. Some of the senior high schools in Utah which did not offer foreign language instruction during 1965-1966 might have offered this instruction if a qualified teacher could have been employed or if in-service training could have been provided for a teacher who had limited training. Several of the teachers assigned to teach foreign language classes in Utah were in need of in-service training which would help them build their proficiency in the language and in skills of teaching the language.

The State's educational television station, KUED, Channel 7, is a medium which might be used to reach remote areas of the State and offer in-service training to teachers as well as instruction to students. This study was designed to explore the assistance that might be provided to a specific segment of the educational population of Utah.

II. PROBLEM

The purpose of this research was to determine the effect upon teachers and upon students that a television program would have that was designed to provide in-service training and classroom instruction in Spanish.

Three small high schools in Utah, including three teachers and their Spanish I students, Groups A, B, and C, participated in the study.

The constant elements within the groups were described as follows:

1. None of the teachers participating in the project had been trained in methods of teaching a foreign language.

2. The program of instruction or text to be used was John Oller's La Familia Fernandez, published by Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc.

3. The three groups of high school classes participating in the project were visited by an observer who assessed the learning situation and class atmosphere.

4. All of the students were given the same tests to determine their aptitude for learning a language, their growth in pronunciation of Spanish, and their knowledge of Spanish learned during the school year 1965-1966. An I.Q. for each student was obtained based upon the language factors of the California Test of Mental Maturity.

5. The teachers were given the same test to determine their growth in Spanish during the school year 1965-1966.

The variable elements in the experiment were described as follows:

1. The teacher of Group A was given in-service training in teaching Spanish using conventional methods; e.g., person to person consultation, discussion, and demonstrations.

2. The teachers of Groups B and C were given in-service training in teaching Spanish as they observed the television class.

3. The students of Group C observed the television class three days per week for thirty minutes as their teacher observed the program. The students of this group were asked to recite and respond when the television teacher requested such response.

The confounding variables* described in the project were centered in the differences in the preparation of the three teachers.

*Conditions and situations over which the researcher has little or no control.

1. Teacher A had thirty-one quarter hours of Spanish on his college transcript. He was not fluent in Spanish, but he had taught Spanish at least four years prior to the research project.

2. Teacher B had no college credit in Spanish, but he had worked as a missionary for the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-Day Saints (Mormon Church) in Mexico for two and one-half years approximately five years prior to the time of his participation in the project. He had taught Spanish two years prior to the school year 1965-66.

3. Teacher C had only nine hours of Spanish on her college transcript. She had worked with groups of students two years preceding this project using A Programmed Course in Spanish, Unit A, by Stanley M. Sapon. This program was formerly published by Encyclopedia Britannica Films, Inc. as a part of its Temac Programmed Learning Materials.

Several other confounding variables entered into the project during the school year. These variables were not anticipated yet they had tremendous influence on the research and completely changed the anticipated results. The more critical of these confounding and unanticipated variables are listed below:

1. The translator or sub-stations of the television network were unreliable due to lack of maintenance. School B received about fifty per cent of the total number of lessons televised. School C received only about thirty per cent of the total number of television lessons transmitted. School C also had difficulty getting the antennae of their receiver put up and functioning properly.

2. Teacher A refused to use the basic text and program of instruction as the text for his class after about the second month of the project. He used La Familia Fernandez as a supplement text to the program of instruction he was using prior to the project.

3. Teacher A refused to take the post-experiment "MLA Proficiency Test for Teachers and Advanced Students".

4. The television teacher had to retain his regular teaching position and could devote only part-time to the television program.

5. The two young ladies who participated on the television program did not devote sufficient time to learning Spanish and they, therefore, did not present a model of accuracy, enthusiasm and confidence when theyappeared in the television programs.

A. The Problem in Regard to the Teachers

It was assumed that the teaching proficiency of the teachers would be reflected in the language performance of their students in regard to the following factors:

1. Pronunciation
2. Accuracy of structure while speaking
3. Reading comprehension
4. Vocabulary
5. Listening comprehension
6. Knowledge of grammar

It was assumed that an additional index of teacher growth in the language would be indicated in the teacher's performance on the Modern Language Association Proficiency Test for Teachers and Advanced Students. This test was given in pre- and post-experiment examinations.

B. The Problem in Regard to the Students

It was assumed that the amount of learning achieved by the students would be reflected in their performance on the tests designed to measure proficiency in the following factors:

1. Pronunciation
2. Accuracy of structure while speaking
3. Reading comprehension
4. Knowledge of vocabulary
5. Listening comprehension
6. Knowledge of grammar

The tests written to measure the factors listed above were based upon the vocabulary, grammar, and phonetical elements contained in the Spanish program of instruction used by all groups participating in the project.

Specific questions to be considered in the study:

1. If one group of students performed on a higher level than the other groups in the testing program, can the difference in performance be attributed:
    - a) To the teacher's ability to teach? Was this skill influenced by the in-service training experienced by the teacher?
    - b) To the teacher's knowledge of Spanish? Was this knowledge influenced by the program of instruction used in the project?
    - c) To the language ability of the students as determined by:
        - (1) I.Q. Test, language factors?
        - (2) Prognosis test of language learning aptitude?
        - (3) Other factors
    - d) To the maturity of the students as indicated by chronological age?
    - e) To factors other than those listed above?

III. PROCEDURES

A. Teachers

Three teachers and their students (N=53) in Spanish I accepted an invitation to participate in the project. The teachers were compared in regard to:

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Teaching experience
4. Credit hours of Spanish on college transcripts
5. Bachelor degree, major and minor subject
6. Teaching load
7. Pre- and post-experiment test, "MLA Proficiency Test for Teachers and Advanced Students"
8. Classroom atmosphere as described by the project observer

B. Students

Students of all three groups participating in the project were compared in regard to:

1. Chronological age
2. Score on a standardized mental maturity test--language factors, California Test of Mental Maturity
3. Scores achieved on the MLA Aptitude Test. Form A by John B. Carroll and Stanley Sapon
4. Scores achieved on a pre- and post-experiment comprehensive test which was designed to measure (a) reading comprehension, (b) vocabulary, (c) listening comprehension, and (d) knowledge of grammar. This test was written by Helia A. de Box.
5. Scores achieved on three speaking tests which were designed to measure (a) pronunciation, and (b) accuracy or correctness of structure as recorded on a tape in response to taped directives and/or questions put by a native speaker. These tests were written by Helia A. de Box.

C. Television Program

The television program was designed to (1) teach Spanish to high school students, and (2) demonstrate appropriate procedures and techniques of teaching Spanish to teachers who were limited in knowledge and fluency in Spanish and who were limited in knowledge of methodology of teaching Spanish.

The teacher of the television class, Mr. Eugene K. Amundsen, had a bachelor's degree with a major in Spanish and had completed all of the course work for a master's degree with a major in Spanish. He had taught eight years in the public schools and had attended an NDEA Institute at Utah State University in Logan, Utah. He had used the program of instruction, La Familia Fernandez, the year prior to the pilot study in his junior high classes of Spanish.

The television teacher used procedures outlined in the teacher's manual. His television class consisted of two young ladies who were freshmen students at the University of Utah and who had never studied Spanish previously. These two television students participated as though they were in a regular Spanish class; e.g., they repeated the phrases and sentences in the pauses that were provided and responded to questions put by the T.V. teacher; they also responded to the various types of drills and exercises directed by the teacher. A general outline of the procedures used and the sequence of presenting the lessons on the television program can be found below.

Proposed Sequence of TV Lessons Suggested Teaching Techniques
for Secondary Spanish Program
La Familia Fernandez

Monday

TV Teacher

1. Introduces lesson, part A
2. Presents lesson through films, filmstrips, and tape
3. Makes further explanation
4. Makes suggestions to classroom teacher and students for learning activities and demonstrates with the TV class

Classroom Teacher - After TV program:

1. Reviews in his class the material of part A presented by TV teacher

2. Uses the techniques suggested by the TV teacher

Tuesday

Classroom Teacher

1. Reviews again the materials in part A presented by the TV teacher the previous day

2. Uses the techniques suggested by the TV teacher

3. Encourages the students to apply the suggestions made by the TV teacher by acting out the dialogues and drills

Wednesday

TV Teacher

1. Uses two TV students or TV assistants and demonstrates again how he teaches part A of the lesson. He teaches the TV students to use the material on their own

2. Introduces next phase of the lesson or part B

3. Makes further explanation about part B

4. Makes suggestions to classroom teachers and students for learning activities for part B

5. Uses TV assistants and demonstrates teaching techniques by actually teaching the TV students

Classroom Teacher - After TV program

1. Reviews with students part A of the lesson

2. Practices and reviews materials of part B of the lesson using suggested techniques

Thursday

TV Teacher

1. Demonstrates with TV class how he teaches part B of the lesson. The TV assistants demonstrate their new learning

2. Introduces and demonstrates part C of the lesson, etc.

Classroom Teacher

1. Reviews with students part B of the lesson

2. Goes into part three or C of the lesson

Friday

Classroom Teacher

1. Reviews part C of the lesson and gets students to apply what they have learned in this part

2. Reviews parts A and B of the lesson

The sequence progresses into parts D, E, and F of each lesson

D. In-Service Training of Teachers

Teacher A, In-Service Training via Conventional Approach

Teacher A was given in-service training using conventional workshop techniques to analyze and review the content and methods required in the *La Familia Fernandez* program of instruction. The use of films, filmstrips with tapes, student visually cued text, student reading and writing text and the teacher's manual are integral parts of this system. Usually the content of the lesson and methods for teaching the content were discussed in the in-service sessions. Summaries of the grammar covered in each lesson and additional substitution and repetition drills were provided as well. One meeting was devoted to orienting this teacher to the materials and procedures to be followed in the use of "La Familia". Two or three demonstrations were given using the students of the class. Suggestions and encouragement were given this teacher after he had been observed by the Principal Investigator. Student performance on the speaking tests was reviewed during three of the in-service visits.

Approximately eleven visits were made to Teacher A, but these visits were apparently not sufficient.

Teachers B and C, In-Service Training via TV Program

It was assumed that teachers B and C would gain in-service training by observing a master teacher on the television program. The television class consisted of the teacher and two capable students. These students went through the process of learning Spanish; they participated as though they were in a regular Spanish class and recited and responded as the situation required.

Teacher B observed this program alone in order to become acquainted with the content of the lesson and the procedures to follow in teaching the lesson to his own class. He was counseled to use certain procedures for post-television learning activities and to follow the example of the television teacher. Teacher B was oriented to the materials, content and teaching techniques to be used in *La Familia Fernandez* program just prior to the beginning of the project in an individual in-service training session.

The in-service training program described above for Teacher B applied to Teacher C, but an additional element was added in the fact that Teacher C and her students observed the program together. In this respect, the students of Teacher C also came under the direction of the television teacher during the time that the television class was being viewed by the group. This situation prevailed three days per week for thirty minutes per program.

IV. THE DATA

A. Data Pertaining to the Teachers

Based upon the data assembled in Table I, the most obvious factors which would apparently account for the difference in the individual's ability to teach Spanish effectively would be the lack of training in Spanish of Teacher C and the lack of experience of Teacher B. The teaching load of each of the teachers was burdensome. Teacher A had five preparations per day as he met one hundred twenty-five students. Teacher B had four preparations per day as he met one hundred twenty-one students. Teacher C had six preparations per day as she met eighty-four students.

TABLE I
BACKGROUND, PROFESSIONAL TRAINING AND MISCELLANEOUS
DATA PERTAINING TO SPANISH TEACHERS

Item	Teacher A		Teacher B		Teacher C	
Sex	Male		Male		Female	
Age	48		27		51	
Teaching Experience						
Years Completed	19		2		12	
Yrs. Teach. Span.	8 approx.		2		2 approx.	
Quarter Hours Spanish	31		0*		9	
Bachelor's Degree	1948		1965		1937	
Major	Secretarial Prac.		Bio. Science		Elem. Ed.	
Minor	English		Comp. Major		English and Political Science for Sec. Certificate	
Teaching Load 1965-66 Period						
1st	Spanish I	22	Preparation		Eng. 7-9	25
2nd	Shorthand	12	Biology	21	Eng. 10-12	24
3rd	English B	28	Math 7	20	Preparation	
4th	Preparation		Math 7	21	Spanish I	10
5th	Bokkpng.	26	Math 8	15	Rem. Read.	10
6th	English B	15	Spanish I	22	Spch. Dbt.	5
7th	Art	22	Math 8	22	Spec'l Eng.	10
		125		121		
	Formula	121		113	(Not Computed)	

*Lived 2½ years in Mexico serving as a missionary

The performance of the three teachers on the pre-experiment "MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Test for Teachers and Advanced Students" indicated that Teacher B was probably stronger in Spanish than Teachers A or C. Teacher C performed on a substantially higher level than the other two teachers in the "Professional Preparation" test. Teacher A performed rather well in the "Speaking" test.

The performance of Teachers B and C in the post-experiment "MLA Test" was surprising because there were more losses than gains on the scores obtained by these teachers in the various tests. While his pre-experiment score was 78 on the "Speaking" test, Teacher B dropped to a score of 55 in the post-experiment test. He did make a commendable gain from 48 to 55 in the "Professional Preparation" test. His performance in the other tests was the same or nearly the same.

Teacher C achieved about the same performance in all categories but made a rather marked loss from 44 down to 31 in the "Speaking" test.

Teacher A refused to take the test a second time upon the completion of the project.

The percentile ranking value assigned to the raw scores of the post-experiment test would indicate that the teachers who took part in the project are far below standard in their knowledge of Spanish and in their ability to use it proficiently. This does not mean that they will have to remain this way.

A summary of these data can be found in Table II.

TABLE II
SUMMARY OF TEACHER PERFORMANCE ON MLA FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TEST FOR TEACHERS AND ADVANCED STUDENTS

Item	Teachers											
	A				B				C			
	Pre-Score	%-tile	Post-* Score	%-tile	Pre-Score	%-tile	Post-Score	%-tile	Pre-Score	%-tile	Post-Score	%-tile
Listening Compreh.	27	1			38	45	38	30	31	12	28	1
Speaking	69	55			78	70	55	7	44	9	31	0
Reading	29	8			34	22	37	20	36	30	34	12
Writing	25	5			36	25	34	10	24	3	29	4
Prof. Prep.	47	5			48	6	55	4	66	70	62	20

*Teacher A refused to take the test again at the end of the school year.

Observations of Spanish Classes

Based upon the reports of the observer, some generalizations may be made about the class atmosphere and learning situation in the three Spanish classes of the project.

The children were usually attentive and demonstrated that they wanted to learn.

The balance of the items on the observation report form dealt with the teacher and teaching procedures.

Teacher A

In the two visits made by the observer to the class of Teacher A, it did not appear that he had a plan nor did he use the visual aids (e.g., films, tapes, and filmstrips) provided as an integral part of the test. During the first visit it did not appear that Teacher A had the children participate in small groups nor individually. The observer thought that he used English excessively in his Spanish class. Teacher A served as the model for phrases and expressions during the observer's visits and apparently made errors. He did not correct errors made by the students in the proper manner according to the observer. There was fluency of response on the part of the students in choral repetition only.

During the first visit, the evaluator or observer thought that the students demonstrated mastery of the dialogue lines and understood them, pronounced them correctly, and repeated them with grammatical correctness. During the second visit, the accuracy of pronunciation and the grammatical correctness were lacking in the expressions given by the students.

The observer thought that the students were not given the opportunity to use sufficiently the language on their own.

Teacher B

Teacher B did not have a plan in evidence, but he did use the audio-visual aids that accompanied the text. He allowed his students to participate only in the total group during the first visit but made provisions for small groups and individuals to participate during the second visit.

Teacher B seemed to improve in the category of using a minimum of English as observed during the second visit. A correct model of speech was provided through the use of tapes. This instructor gave more attention to correcting mistakes of students during the first visit as compared to the second visit. This teacher made it possible for students to respond fluently in total group and small group situation, but he did not make provisions for individuals to respond fluently. The students of this teacher seemed to memorize the lines of the dialogue with understanding, repeat them accurately and with grammatical correctness during both visits with the exception that their pronunciation was not up to standard during the second visit. These students did not have adequate opportunity to use the language on their own in situations which approximated those illustrated or modeled in the text and which required the student to adapt the patterns they had learned in the lessons.

Teacher C

Teacher C was given positive ratings or remarks on all categories on the observational report form during the first visit, but there were some modifications in the report on the second and third visits.

The observer pointed out that this teacher kept the use of English to a minimum considering her very limited knowledge of Spanish. The correct model of speech had to be provided by the tapes. It was pointed out that the teacher's command of the language did not permit adequate correction of mistakes made by the students while speaking.

Teacher C was the only teacher who, while being observed, gave the students an opportunity to use the language on their own in situations which approximated those illustrated in the text.

Data pertaining to observations of Spanish classes may be found in Table III which follows.

TABLE III
OBSERVATIONS OF SPANISH CLASSES*

First Visit, November 18 and 19, 1965

Criteria	Teachers		
	A	B	C
1. Did the teacher have a plan and appropriate props?	No plan apparent; no props.	No plans were evident.	Yes, all props (tapes and filmstrips) were used.
2. Was the class attentive and did the children show eagerness to learn?	Yes, the students seemed enthusiastic and seemed to be participating well.	Yes, they participated well in class activities.	Yes, they were enthusiastic and participated well.
3. Was there evidence that each child participated:			
In total group?	Yes, all at this level.	Yes.	Yes, good participation.
In small group?	No participation at this level.	No participation at this level.	Yes, at all levels.
Individually?	No individual participation.	No participation at this level.	Yes, at all levels.
4. Was the use of English kept to a minimum?	Too much English was used by the teacher.	No, a good deal was used.	Yes, tapes were used exclusively for patterns.

*Observations were made by Mrs. Helia Araujo de Box.

TABLE III continued
OBSERVATIONS OF SPANISH CLASSES

First Visit, November 18 and 19, 1965

Criteria	Teachers		
	A	B	C
5. Was there a correct model of speech at all times?	No. Tapes were not used and teacher made some errors in use of verbs.	Yes, the tape provided the model.	Yes, that which was provided by the tapes.
6. Was there evidence of immediate correction of mistakes?	Not in an adequate manner.	Yes, by the instructor.	Yes, correction was provided by teacher and tapes.
7. Was there fluency of responses?	Yes, in choral repetition.	Yes, in repetition of tape models.	Yes, tape patterns were followed well.
8. Did the children show mastery (memorization) of the dialogue lines?			All performance high on this point.
a) With understanding?	Yes	Yes, to a certain extent.	Yes
b) With accurate pronunciation?	Yes	Yes, in choral repetition.	Yes
c) With grammatical correctness?	Yes	Yes, since taped models were correct.	Yes
Notes	Teacher did not seem to be in accord with experiment.		

TABLE III continued
OBSERVATIONS OF SPANISH CLASSES

Second Visit, January 27 and 28, 1966

Criteria	Teachers		
	A	B	C
1. Did the teacher have a plan and appropriate teaching aids?	No, use was not made of audio-visual aids available for the project.	All available aids were utilized.	On the day of the visitation the teacher followed project plan but was unable to receive the television program.
2. Was the class attentive and did the students show eagerness to learn?	Yes, general class attitude was commendable.	Class organization and administration were rather confused and unruly.	Yes, class shows above average motivation and participation.
3. Was there evidence that each child participated:			
In the total group?	Yes	Yes	Yes
In a small group?	Yes	Yes, dialogue was done in groups of two.	Yes
Individually?	Yes, question, answer approach.	Yes	Yes, question, answer approach.
4. Was the use of English kept to a minimum?	No, excessive use of English was quite evident.	Yes, but it could have been improved.	Teacher possesses very limited knowledge of the Spanish language.

TABLE III continued
OBSERVATIONS OF SPANISH CLASSES

Second Visit, January 27 and 28, 1966

Criteria	Teachers		
	A	B	C
5. Was there a correct model of speech at all times?	No, speech model was inadequate.	Yes, providing audio-visual aids were used.	Yes, but only that provided by audio-visual aids.
6. Was there evidence of immediate correction of mistakes? (speaking)	No, organization of technique was inappropriate.	Not immediately recognizable as such.	No, teacher's command of language does not permit adequate correction.
7. Was there a fluency of responses:			
In the total group?	Yes	Yes	Yes
In a small group?	No	Yes	No, participation was not up to expected standards of proficiency.
Individually?	No	No, inadequate opportunity provided.	Yes
8. Did the children show mastery (memorization) of the dialogue lines:			
With understanding?	Yes	Yes	Yes
With accurate pronunciation?	No	No, pronunciation was not up to ideal standards.	No
With grammatical correctness?	No	Yes	No

TABLE III continued
OBSERVATIONS OF SPANISH CLASSES

Second Visit, January 27 and 28, 1966

Criteria	Teachers		
	A	B	C
9. Were the children able to use the language on their own in situations which approximate those illustrated in the text and which require the student to adapt and vary patterns previously learned?	No, teacher monopolized class time.	Not adequate	Not possible to determine due to limited scope of observational situation.

TABLE III continued
OBSERVATIONS OF SPANISH CLASSES

Third Visit, April 28 and 29, 1966

Criteria	Teachers		
	A	B	C
1. Did the teacher have a plan and appropriate props?	*	*	Listening tapes and cue sheets were utilized.
2. Was the class attentive and did the students show eagerness to learn?			Yes, as in previous observations.
3. Was there evidence that each child participated?			
In the total group?			Yes
In a small group?			Yes
Individually?			Yes
4. Was the use of English kept to a minimum?			Yes, considering the teacher's limited knowledge of Spanish.
5. Was there a correct model of speech at all times?			That provided by listening to the tapes.
6. Was there evidence of immediate correction of mistakes?			Correction of mistakes was limited to models provided by tape.

TABLE III continued
OBSERVATIONS OF SPANISH CLASSES

Third Visit, April 28 and 29, 1966

Criteria	Teachers		
	A	B	C
7. Was there fluency of responses?	*	*	
In total group?			Yes
In a small group?			Yes
Individually?			Yes
8. Did the children show mastery (memorization) of the dialogue lines:			
With understanding?			Yes
With accurate pronunciation?			Not quite
With grammatical correctness?			Relatively so
9. Were the children able to use the language on their own in situations which approximate those illustrated in the test and which require the student to adapt and vary patterns previously learned?			Students reproduced scenes from the textbook in notebook drawings and talked in Spanish about the pictures they had drawn.

*Mrs. Box did not observe the class on this visit due to the fact that she presented the entire student body an assembly program on the customs and culture of Mexico.

B. Data Pertaining to the Students

The performance of the students on the Modern Language Aptitude Test indicated that there was no significant difference among the students of the three schools in aptitude to learn a foreign language. The statistical treatment of these data may be found in Table IV below.

The mean score for School A was 87.71, School B was 79.86, and School C was 89.10.

TABLE IV

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON MODERN LANGUAGE APTITUDE TEST

Source	df	SS	MS	F*
Between	2	19,021.78	449.51	1.18
Within	50	889.02	380.44	
Total	52	19,920.80		

*F is not significant at 1%, 5% or 10% level of confidence.

The performance of the students on the pre-experiment Comprehensive Language Examination indicated that there was no significant difference among the students of the three schools in their knowledge of Spanish. The mean score on this test was School A, 32.52; School B, 34.81; and School C, 37.22. Statistical treatment of these data can be found in Table V below.

TABLE V

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF STUDENT PERFORMANCE ON COMPREHENSIVE LANGUAGE EXAMINATION PRE-EXPERIMENT

Source	df	SS	MS	F*
Between	2	2,010.19	74.20	1.77
Within	48	148.40	41.88	
Total	50	2,158.59		

*F is not significant at the 1%, 5%, or 10% level of confidence.

A simple analysis of variance of gain scores on the post-experiment performance on the Comprehensive Language Examination indicated a significant difference between the mean score of the three groups at the one per cent level of confidence. The mean score gain for School A was 23.88, School B gained only 5.15 points, and School C gained 10.70 points. The statistical treatment of these data can be found on Table VI below.

TABLE VI

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF GAIN SCORES ON COMPREHENSIVE LANGUAGE EXAMINATION POST-EXPERIMENT MINUS PRE-EXPERIMENT

Source	df	SS	MS	F*
Between	2	3,298.05	1,649.03	21.72**
Within	44	3,340.42	75.92	
Total	46			

**Significant at the 1% level

A further statistical treatment, the Scheffe[1] Analysis of least significant difference indicated that this difference was significant at beyond the five per cent level of confidence. School A did significantly better than Schools B and C. These data can be found in Table VII.

It appears that Group A performed at a higher level than Groups B and C in the area of reading comprehension, vocabulary, listening comprehension, and knowledge of grammar as measured by the Comprehensive Language Examination.

TABLE VII

LEAST SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE ANALYSIS[1] OF MEAN GAIN SCORES ON COMPREHENSIVE LANGUAGE EXAMINATION

School	Mean	School B	School C	School A
B	5.15	--	5.55*	18.73*
C	10.70		--	13.18*
A	23.88			--

*Significant at 5% level

---

[1] Scheffe, H., The Analysis of Variance. New York: Wiley Co., 1959.

Three statistical procedures were employed to further analyze the data obtained from the Comprehensive Language Examination.

The hypothesis was tested that the variance due to the effect of different schools would be zero. The computed F was 7.29 (significant at the one per cent level of confidence). The null hypothesis was rejected, and it was concluded that there was a significant contribution to the variance made in the scores of the Comprehensive Language Examination, due to effect of the different schools.

The hypothesis was tested that the variance in the performance of the students in the Comprehensive Language Examination due to the effect of the test-retest factor of learning would be zero. The computed F was 74.58 which was highly significant at the .01 level. It was concluded that there was a highly significant contribution in the overall variance due to the effects of learning.

The hypothesis was tested that the variance in performance was due to a combination of the effect of differences among schools and the effect of learning would be zero. A computed F of 21.72 was obtained and was significant at the one per cent level of confidence. The null hypothesis was rejected again, and it was decided that there was a significant contribution to the overall variance due to differences in the schools and the factor of learning. These data can be found in Table VIII below.

TABLE VIII

COMPREHENSIVE LANGUAGE EXAMINATION
TWO FACTOR DESIGN WITH REPEATED MEASURES

Source	df	SS	MS	F
Between Subjects	46	4,842.55	105.27	
A (schools)	2	1,206.30	603.15	7.29
Subjects within groups	44	3,636.25	82.64	
Within Subjects	47	7,356.00	156.5	
B (test-retest)	1	2,830.46	2,830.46	74.58
AB (schools x test-retest)	2	1,649.02	824.51	21.72
B x subjects within groups test-retest x subjects within groups	44	1,670.22	37.95	

Hypotheses to be tested

I. Variance due to the effect of different schools is equal to zero.

$$\sigma_{\alpha}^{2} = 0 \qquad F = \frac{ms_a}{\text{ms subj. w groups}} = \frac{603.15}{82.64} = 7.29 \quad (\text{df} = 2,44)$$

Significant at 1% level.

Conclusion: There is a significant contribution to the overall variance due to the effect of the different schools.

TABLE VIII (continued)

II. Variance due to the effect of test x retest (due to learning) is equal to zero.

$$\sigma^2_B = 0$$

$$F = \frac{msb}{ms\ subj\quad w\ groups} = \frac{2830.46}{37.95} = 74.58$$

Significant at 1% level.

Conclusion: There is a highly significant contribution of the overall variance due to the effects of learning.

III. Variance due to the effect of school x test-retest equal zero.

Is there a significant contribution to the overall variance due to the effect of different groups times the effects of learning?

$$\sigma^2_{\alpha B} = 0$$

$$F = \frac{ms\ ab}{ms_B\ x\ subj\ w\ groups} = \frac{824.51}{37.95} = 21.72$$

Significant at 1% level.

Conclusion: There is a significant contribution to the overall variance due to different schools times difference in learning.

A multiple correlation was computed to examine the relationships that might exist among the factors of chronological age of students, the score obtained on the MLA Language Aptitude Test, and I.Q. as determined by performance in the language factors only of the California Mental Maturity Test and the mean gain scores made by each group on the Comprehensive Language Examination given on a pre- and post-test basis.

This treatment indicated that there was a significant correlation at the one per cent level of confidence between the I.Q. (Language Factors only) as determined by the California Short Form of Mental Maturity Test and the language learning aptitude of the students as determined by the MLA Language Aptitude Test. A significant relationship at the one per cent level of confidence was found to exist between the students' I.Q. and the gain score made on the Comprehensive Language Examination on pre-experiment and post-experiment tests.

The correlation between the student's aptitude to learn a foreign language and the gain score made on the Comprehensive Language examination was found to be significant at the five per cent level of confidence. These data can be found in Table IX following.

TABLE IX
CORRELATION OF STUDENTS AGE, APTITUDE, IQ, AND GAIN SCORES

	Age 1	Aptitude Language 2	I.Q. Lang. Factors 3	Gain Score Compr. Lang. Exam. 4	Mean	SD	N
Age 1	100				185.6415	13.8995	53
Aptitude Language 2	21	100			84.7170	19.5727	53
I.Q. Lang. Factors 3	3	51**	100		108.8868	10.2800	53
Gain Score Compr.Lang. Exam. 4	16	31*	40**	100	23.6981	11.8623	53

Note: Decimals omitted
*Significant at 5% level of confidence
**Significant at 1% level of confidence

An additional statistical procedure, analysis of co-variance, was used in which the factors of age, aptitude, and I.Q. were controlled or varied out in order to obtain an index of the difference between schools in the gain scores. This procedure provided additional evidence to show that there was a significant difference at the one per cent level of confidence between the three groups in the gain scores made on the Comprehensive Language Examination. The statistical data are found in Table X.

TABLE X
ANALYSIS OF COVARIANCE ON COMPREHENSIVE LANGUAGE EXAMINATION GAIN SCORES

Source	DF	YY	Sum-Squares (DUE)	Sum-Squares (About)	DF	Mean-Square	F
Treatment (Between)	2	3972.6689					
Error (Within)	50	3344.5010	841.8589	2502.6421	47	53.2477	
Treatment + Error (Total)	52	7317.1699	1386.2832	5930.8867	49		
Difference for Testing Adjusted Treatment Means				3428.2446	2	1714.1223	32.191**

**Significant at the 1% level

Hypothesis: No difference among treatments after adjusting with covariates.
Hypothesis was rejected.

Variables: Dependent Variable: Gain Score on Comprehensive Lang. Exam.
Covariates: Age in months
Aptitude on (M.L.A. Apt. Test)
I.Q. Language Factors on Cal. Mental Maturity Test

Pronunciation

The results of Speaking Test One given December 1965 indicated a significant difference in the pronunciation among the students of the three schools. This difference among students was significant at nearly the one per cent level of confidence. The Scheffe' technique of analysis of least significant differences (L.S.D.) confirmed the fact that the difference was between School A and School B.

Speaking Test Two given approximately three months later, March 1966, indicated that the difference in pronunciation performance among the students of the three schools was significant at the five per cent level of confidence.

Speaking Test Three given in May 1966 indicated that there were some differences in the pronunciation among students, but these differences were not statistically significant. These data can be found in Table XI below.

TABLE XI
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SCORES AMONG SCHOOLS ON PRONUNCIATION PHASE OF THREE SPEAKING TESTS

	Test 1 Mean Score	Test 2 Mean Score	Test 3 Mean Score
School A	10.25	7.29	7.77
School B	8.97	5.93	6.70
School C	9.30	7.36	6.56
Highest Score Possible	15.0	15.0	15.0
F Calculated	5.08**	3.86*	3.00

*Significant at 5% level
**Significant at 1% level

ANALYSIS OF LEAST SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE[1] OF MEAN SCORES BETWEEN SCHOOLS

LSD required at 5%	1.15	1.51
Computed LSD between	School A & School B 1.28* School A & School C .95	School C & School B 1.43 School A & School B 1.36

[1] Scheffe' Method
*Significant at 5%

Directed Utterances

Part two of each Speaking Test consisted of directed utterances or statements made by the students as directed or as they were asked questions by a native speaker's voice on a tape.

Speaking Test One showed that there was a significant difference among the students in their ability to use the language. School A was clearly superior in this regard. Speaking Test Two revealed the same situation, but Speaking Test Three indicated that School C performed on a higher level or at least had the highest mean score. The difference between Schools C and B was significant at the five per cent level of confidence in Speaking Test Three.

These data were taken from Table XII below.

TABLE XII
ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE OF MEAN SCORES AMONG SCHOOLS ON DIRECTED UTTERANCES PHASE OF THREE SPEAKING TESTS

	Test 1 Mean Score	Test 2 Mean Score	Test 3 Mean Score
School A	15.52	15.14	8.20
School B	5.82	5.96	5.27
School C	6.70	7.83	9.06
Score Possible	30.0	40.0	30.0
F Calculated	28.86**	27.83**	5.55*

*Significant at 5% level
**Significant at 1% level

ANALYSIS OF LEAST SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCE[1] OF MEAN SCORES BETWEEN SCHOOLS

LSD Required at 5%	3.81	3.45	3.06
Computed LSD between	School A & School B 9.70 School A & School C 8.82	School A & School B 9.81 School A & School C 7.31	School C & School B 3.79

[1] Scheffe´ Method

THE SCHOOLS IN THE EXPERIMENT COMPARED WITH THREE OTHER SCHOOLS

In order to get a basis of comparison, three additional schools were asked to take the comprehensive language examination on a pre- and post-experiment basis.

The teachers at two of the three schools were experienced veterans who had attended NDEA Institutes and had majored in Spanish. The third teacher had not majored in Spanish and had not had a course in methods of teaching a foreign language.

The results of the pre-experiment test indicated a significant difference between the students at Davis High and Provo High. This was attributed to three native speakers in the class at Davis High. In the post-experiment test, the results indicated no significant difference between the performance of the students in School A and those in Provo High and Davis High. This would show that Teacher A was effective in teaching his students to learn Spanish tested in this particular testing instrument. These data are taken from Table XIII.

TABLE XIII
SUMMARY OF STATISTICAL ANALYSIS, COMPREHENSIVE LANGUAGE EXAMINATION AND GAIN SCORES ON CLE FOR FIVE HIGH SCHOOLS

Analysis of Variance
Comprehensive Language Examination #1 or Pre-Experiment Test

	School B	School A	School C	Davis	Wayne	Provo	Total
N	21	21	9	18	28	27	124
Mean	34.81	32.52	37.22	41.17	33.18	30.30	34.17

Source	SS	df	ms (σ^2)	F
Among	1463.17	5	292.63	4.46**
Within	7746.28	118	65.65	
Total	9209.45	123		

**Significant at the 1% level

Significant difference between mean gain scores of five schools

Scheffe′ Method, Least Significant Difference Analysis
Summary of Differences of Means Between Schools

Mean	School	Provo	Sch. A	Wayne	Sch. B	Sch. C	Davis
30.30	Provo	--	2.22	2.88	4.51	6.92	10.87*
32.52	Sch. A		--	0.62	2.29	4.70	8.65
33.18	Wayne			--	1.63	4.04	7.99
34.81	Sch. B				--	2.41	6.36
37.22	Sch. C					--	3.95
41.17	Davis						--

*Significant at the 5% level. Davis High had about three native speakers in the class.

TABLE XIII (continued)

Analysis of Variance, Comprehensive Language Exam. Gain Scores

	Sch. B	Sch. A	Sch. C	Provo	Davis	Wayne	
n	20	17	10	25	14	22	N = 108
Mean	5.15	23.88	10.70	30.08	28.14	8.50	18.05

Source	SS	df	ms(σ^2)	F
Among	11,497.29	5	2299.46	22.20**
Within	10,567.48	102	103.60	
Total	22,064.77			

**Significant at 1% level.

Significant difference between means of the five schools.

Scheffe' Method, Least Significance Difference Analysis
Summary of Differences of Means Between Schools

Mean	Sch.	Sch. B	Wayne	Sch. C	Sch. A	Davis	Provo
5.15	B	--	3.35	5.55	18.73*	22.99*	24.93*
8.50	Wayne		--	2.20	15.38*	19.64*	21.58*
10.70	C			--	13.18*	17.44*	19.38*
23.88	A				--	4.26	6.20
28.14	Davis					--	1.94
30.308	Provo						--

*Difference between means of schools significant at 5% level.

V. OBSERVATIONS & SUGGESTIONS

OBSERVATIONS

Few, if any, conclusions can be made on the basis of this pilot study because of the unforeseen events that invalidated the basic premises and conditions of the investigation. The major factors in this regard were the failure of the schools to receive the television programs due to (1) malfunction of the translators or substations and (2) failure to get the antenna operating at School C. Of equal devastating effect upon the study was the decision of Teacher A to not use the basic program La Familia Fernandez as a basic text but to use it only as a supplementary text. His refusal to take the post-experiment "MLA Test of Proficiency for Teachers and Advanced Students" had further negative effects upon the results of the experiment.

In spite of these conditions and situations, some interesting data were obtained which form the basis of the observations made below.

Teachers

It appeared that the two distinguishing characteristics in the background of the three teachers were the lack of total teaching experience of Teacher B and the lack of knowledge of Spanish of Teacher C.

Apparently the post-experiment test, the "MLA Proficiency Test for Teachers and Advanced Students", was far too difficult for teachers B and C and, in all probability, Teacher A. Perhaps it would have been better to have given them the Comprehensive Language Examination pre- and post-experiment to determine if growth took place in their knowledge of Spanish contained in the program of instruction.

In regard to classroom atmosphere and learning situation, teacher A never appeared to be at ease with the materials and the requisite equipment which La Familia Fernandez program of instruction demanded. He never used the materials as they had been demonstrated to him and as recommended in the teacher's manual, yet his students learned a great deal. He is to be commended for the sincere effort he made in attempting to learn how to use this program of instruction. He discontinued using this text, because he worried to the point where his health was threatened.

It appeared that Teacher B never prepared thoroughly or adequately to use the materials of La Familia Fernandez as demonstrated on the television program and as explained in the teacher's manual. Teacher B asked for additional help and demonstrations, but this help was not given to him in a demonstration using his students. The purpose of the study was to determine whether this type of in-service training could be obtained by watching an experienced teacher perform in a televised classroom.

Teacher C seemed willing to try the teaching procedures demonstrated on the TV program and outlined in the teacher's manual. She apparently accomplished more with her students than Teacher B accomplished with his students. This difference may be attributed to the greater amount of teaching experience and the higher amount of knowledge about teaching possessed by Teacher C. It should be mentioned that the first television lesson went on the air on October 11, 1965. This teacher and her class did not view the television class until the first week in January 1966. This class was able to receive the sound or audio signal early in the fall of 1965, but they did not receive the picture until much later.

If performance of students is a criterion of teacher effectiveness, then Teacher A was more effective than Teacher B and Teacher C in most respects, because the students of School A performed on the highest level as reflected by the mean gain score on the written comprehensive language examination (See Table VII). In regard to performance of the students in pronunciation, Group A gained the highest score on Test One, but on the second speaking test, students in Group C performed on the highest level. In the third speaking test, all of the students performed on about the same level (See Table XI). It appeared that all three groups performed on a slightly descending trend in this skill as shown by their performance on the three tests.

In the area of language usage, Group A was the most effective as reflected by the scores these students obtained on the first two speaking tests. However, on test three the students of School C performed on the highest level. Perhaps this was due to the persistence of Teacher C in the proper use of the materials and to the decline in use of the text and materials by Teacher A (See Table XII).

Students

All groups were the same in regard to age, intelligence quotient (language factors) and in their capacity to learn a language. Statistically, there were no significant differences in the three groups in the categories mentioned (Table IX). There was no significant difference among the three groups in their performance on the Comprehensive Language Examination the first time they took this test (Table V).

Mean Gain on Comprehensive Language Examination

On the Comprehensive Language Examination, which was essentially a reading and writing test, the students in School A performed on a much higher level than did the students at Schools B and C. This might have been the result of many factors such as (1) greater drive or desire for learning, (2) more teaching skill displayed by their teacher, (3) the influence of studying in another text or (4) the Hawthorne effect, or (5) some other factor not known. In any event, it was established that these students were not very different than the students at the other schools in terms of age, intelligence or ability to learn a language (Table IX).

It should be mentioned that the Comprehensive Language Examination written for this project was not "standardized" nor analyzed by factor analysis, but it did appear to do the thing it was designed to do.

In the paper and pencil test, or the Comprehensive Language Examination, the students of Teacher A far surpassed the students of the other two schools in the amount of learning achieved in one year. This fact was examined using the analysis of co-variance with the dependent variable as the gain score on the comprehensive examination and the co-variates as age in months, aptitude score, and I.Q. (Table X).

It was interesting to note that among all students of the project, there was correlation at the one per cent level of confidence between I.Q. (language factors only) and language aptitude score. This same high correlation was indicated between I.Q. and the gain score on the comprehensive language examination. The correlation between the score achieved on the language aptitude test and on the gain score made on the comprehensive test was significant at the five per cent level of confidence (Table IX).

Three additional hypotheses were tested statistically to indicate that there was a significant contribution to the overall variance due to the effect of difference in the three schools; there was significant variance due to the effect of the test-retest factor or the amount of learning that took place; and there was significant variance due to a combination of the two factors listed above; e.g., the difference among the three schools plus the difference in the amount of learning (Table VIII).

It was previously established that the three groups of students were similar in age, aptitude and I.Q., yet their performance was significantly different. It is possible that the cause for the difference in performance was related to the teaching ability of the teacher. It is the opinion of the writer that the difference in the teachers' ability to teach existed before the pilot study took place, and the experiences of the teachers in the study had some, but not a significant influence on these differences when measured in terms of the growth or the gain score achieved by the students on the comprehensive language examination. However, it appears that some of the experiences encountered by the teachers in this project influenced their ability to teach when the results of the speaking tests are examined.

Pronunciation

There was a significant difference between the pronunciation of the students of Schools A and B in the first test, but the difference between these schools and among all schools diminished until there was no significant difference when the third speaking test was held in May 1966. The highest score possible for each of the three tests was fifteen. The scores of all students on tests two and three indicated that the students were performing just about at one-third of the level desired, or a perfect score. The scores obtained on the second speaking test were substantially lower than those of the first test. The students of Schools A and B made approximately three points less in the mean score of the second speaking test (See Table XI). It was not possible to pinpoint the reason for this loss. It is suggested that the change in the emphasis placed upon the text used in School A could have contributed to the loss of pronunciation performance. In School B and in School A it could have been the "mid-year slump" that often occurs in foreign language classes. This slump might have been counteracted in School C when they finally got to see the television program.

Application of Language

The tests devised to measure a student's ability to use language in response to a native speaker's questions and directions revealed an interesting pattern of response. There was a significant difference in the mean scores gained on each test, but a surprising reversal in the results of the last test. School A performed on the highest level of the three schools in tests one and two, but School C got the highest score on the final speaking test. School A was high on the first two tests and then dropped approximately seven points from test one to test three on the mean score achieved by the class. School B remained on an even keel at the lowest mean score of all three schools on the three tests while School C showed a gradual increase in performance. Again it should be pointed out that the performance was short of an ideal response (Table XII).

The results of the speaking tests indicate that the students in School A performed on a descending scale of achievement in the use or application of the language. The reports of the observer indicated that Teacher A used the text, La Familia Fernandez, less and less during the school year. He used a text that emphasized grammar, reading, and writing.

The students of School B performed on an even level during the entire year. The Teacher of School B did not appear to change his methods during the year according to the reports of the observer.

The students of School C performed on an increasingly improving scale during the year according to their performance in the speaking tests. The teacher of School C appeared to put more effort and preparation in her teaching as reported by the observer.

Summary of Observations

In response to the questions proposed in Chapter II of this study, it may be said that one group of students performed on a higher level than the other groups on a pencil and paper test and this performance:

1. Could probably be attributed to the teacher's ability to teach. The teacher's skill to teach was apparently not influenced by the in-service training he experienced.

2. Was not apparently influenced by the teacher's knowledge of Spanish. This factor was not really tested in the project; this observation is expressed as the opinion of the writer.

3. Student performance on the Comprehensive Language Examination was directly associated with the student's intelligence and with the student's score on the prognostic test of language aptitude.

4. Was not related to maturity as indicated by chronological age.

In the test which measured the students' ability to use the language, there was some evidence that this achievement was related to the techniques and materials used by the teacher and to the teacher's ability to teach. This skill was influenced by the in-service training experienced by the teacher whose student's performed on the highest level of the third speaking test. This difference in performance could not be related to the teacher's knowledge of Spanish.

SUGGESTIONS FOR TEACHING SPANISH TO SECONDARY STUDENTS ON TV

The pilot study did not achieve its objective of determining the influence upon teachers and upon students of a television program designed to provide in-service training for teachers and instruction in Spanish for students. The failure of the translator stations and the problems with a television antenna prevented the basic assumptions and hypotheses of the study from being tested. However, there were some indications that this objective could be tested and the value of this type of instruction for both students and partially trained teachers could be established. The first recommendation for such a study would be to provide funds and personnel to establish and maintain the television network and receiving systems at each school.

The television teacher should be employed full-time in order to prepare programs and teaching materials that will be of value to the television class and the teachers who are observing for the purpose of improving their knowledge of the language and teaching methods.

The students who appear in the demonstration phase of the television class in Spanish must be eager and poised in their performance. It is recommended that these students be studying Spanish in a regular class as well as on the television program.

The television program must provide for more activities or student participation. This statement applies to those who view the television class.

Untrained or partially trained teachers who participate in a project of this nature should be brought together prior to the beginning of school for a one- or two-week workshop. They should be trained in the use of the materials and equipment used in the program of instruction. The workshop should be conducted by a specialist designated by the publishers of the material being used.

Techniques and procedures found to be successful by experienced foreign language teachers should be taught to the teachers participating in the project. The untrained teachers should be taught to do for themselves all that they can do with ease and efficiency. Parts A and B of each lesson in the La Familia Fernandez series could be taught effectively by the partially trained teacher. Sections of the lessons which are difficult and require greater knowledge of the language might be taught on the television in a predetermined sequence. Parts C, D, E, and F require more skill and teaching techniques. As the untrained teacher gained in proficiency and knowledge of Spanish, more of the teaching responsibility could be turned over to him. The television instruction would be used more and more as a supplemental aid with the passing of time.

In some cases Part C could be taught with ease by the classroom teacher; but when the content was obviously difficult, the lessons could be introduced on television. A great deal of the television instruction would have to be centered around the problems involved in Parts D, E, and F of each lesson. On alternate days, when the television program was not on the air, the classroom teacher could review phases of the lesson which were introduced the day before. In some instances it would be possible to give untrained teachers special help via two-way amplified telephone.

One or two one-day workshops could be conducted during the school year to review teaching techniques, answer questions, and provide individual help to teachers.

Advisor to Teachers

An observer or advisor to the partially qualified teachers should be an absolute requisite for in-service training programs of the nature described in this pilot project. An observer-advisor would insure the continuing growth of the partially trained teacher and enhance the chances for success of the students. This person would help the partially trained teacher clarify his thinking and perception pertaining to content of the language and techniques of teaching the language. He could help the partially trained teacher organize his lessons, evaluate the behavior of the students and provide demonstrations and give assistance and enthusiasm that would more than recompense the cost of his services.

Evaluation

In addition to the long-range tests needed for such a project, there should be weekly tests or tests given at other regular intervals to determine growth in comprehension and in the ability to use the language and pronounce it correctly. A wide variety of tests should be devised to determine the students' ability to use the language. An improvement over the language test recorded on a tape would be a test in which a native speaker put the questions to each student on an individual personal basis. The students' responses could then be recorded for evaluation by a team of qualified specialists.

APPENDIX A

TESTS USED IN THE PILOT STUDY

TESTS WRITTEN FOR THE STUDENT

1. Comprehensive Language Examination in Spanish
2. Speaking Test One
3. Speaking Test Two
4. Speaking Test Three

COPYRIGHTED TESTS USED IN THE STUDY

5. Modern Language Aptitude Test
6. MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Test for Teachers and Advanced Students

COMPREHENSIVE LANGUAGE EXAMINATION

BASED UPON

LA FAMILIA FERNANDEZ

This examination is composed of four parts:

Part I: SILENT READING TEST

The reading test is entirely a paper and pencil test, involving four-choice questions.

Sentence completion questions are used to measure the student's understanding of words and idiomatic expressions.

Passages are drawn from textbook materials and are used to test word and phrase discrimination and ability to understand the main idea, find details and draw conclusions.

Part II. VOCABULARY TEST

Consists of seventy items, involving identification of antonyms and synonyms or related words. Synonym identification tests understanding of word meanings. Antonym identification tests extensiveness of vocabulary.

Part III. LISTENING COMPREHENSION TEST

The student (individually or in a group situation) listens to taped material and then answers four-choice questions based on (a) single utterances and (b) passages. In each case the spoken material attempts to reproduce the language as it is spoken by educated natives. The Spanish speaker is a native of Mexico. The student's answer sheet or test booklet does not contain the four choices in printed form--just the four letters, one of which he marks to indicate his choice.

Part IV: APPLIED GRAMMAR TEST

The student demonstrates his writing ability by actually writing structured responses. He fills in blanks to show his understanding of correct usage of prepositions, pronouns and verb forms.

Examination number 2 is a speaking test. The student receives his instructions from a master tape from the tape recorder. He repeats what he hears with proper pronunciation and intonation.

The student responds to spoken questions involving grammatical correctness.

COMPREHENSIVE LANGUAGE EXAMINATION

School__________

Name__________

Date__________

BASED UPON

LA FAMILIA FERNANDEZ

PART I

SILENT READING TEST

DIRECTIONS: Read each sentence or paragraph carefully. Choose the number of the item which correctly completes the meaning, or answers the question asked, and underline your answer accordingly or mark your answer sheet.

EXAMPLE: ¿Qué responde una persona para indicar que está listo?
1. Estamos listos 2. Estás listo 3. Estoy ocupado
4. Estoy listo

1. Cuando quiero saludar a una persona en la mañana, digo:
   1. Buenas tardes 2. Hasta luego 3. Buenos días
   4. ¿Cómo está Ud.?

2. Cuando dos personas quieren salir y están listos, ¿qué dicen?
   1. Voy 2. Vámonos 3. Sí 4. Van

3. Para obtener silencio en la sala de clase, es necesario decir:
   1. Griten 2. Saluden 3. Cállense 4. Cállate

4. Hace calor cuando:
   1. hace viento 2. está lloviendo 3. hace sol 4. hay nieve

5. ¿Puedo ir conustedes?
   1. No, no puedes 2. Sí, podemos 3. No hay necesidad
   4. No quiero

6. Voy a jugar con mi perro:
   1. en el cine 2. en la biblioteca 3. en el concierto
   4. en el jardín

7. El día antes del lunes es el:
   1. sábado 2. domingo 3. jueves 4. martes

8. Cuando quiero saber donde está mi libro:
   1. llamo por teléfono 2. compro un periódico 3. voy a la biblioteca 4. pregunto por mi libro

9. El pianista _____ muy bien el piano.
1. juega 2. guía 3. toca 4. baila

10. Los niños comen mucho:
1. pan 2. agua 3. leche 4. ácido

11. Mamá, mi amiga María viene esta __________.
1. casa 2. en la noche 3. mañana 4. conmigo

12. ¿Qué responde una persona cuando no va?
1. No vamos 2. No voy 3. No estoy 4. ¿Qué te importa?

13. Se ha presentado la misma película en este:
1. clase 2. hospital 3. cine 4. restaurante

14. Este niño es muy _____.
1. cansado 2. hambre 3. sed 4. perezoso

15. Un buen maestro debe ser _____.
1. alto 2. flojo 3. joven 4. paciente

16. Yo soy profesor; tú _____ estudiante
1. eres 2. estás 3. tienes 4. quieres

17. Si quiero saber el nombre de una persona, le pregunto:
1. ¿Cómo está, Ud.? 2. ¿Cómo se escribe? 3. ¿Cómo se llama?
4. ¿Cómo le va?

18. Si quiero comunicarme con un amigo a otra ciudad, le mando una carta:
1. por correo 2. para correo 3. por teléfono 4. para avión

19. ¿Qué trae mi amigo?
1. Trajo una caja 2. Tiene una caja 3. Trae una caja
4. Traigo una caja

20. Tengo hambre. ¿Qué hay de comer?
1. Están leche y fruta 2. Hay arroz 3. ¿Quieres comer?
4. Si quiero

21. Nos sentamos en:
1. la silla 2. bien 3. el aire 4. el agua

22. Cuando te duele el estómago visitas a:
1. un profesor 2. un veterinario 3. un médico 4. un dentista

23. Para preparar la limonada uso:
1. naranjas 2. piñas 3. limones 4. duraznos

24. Creo que me gusta más el invierno que las otras estaciones porque:
1. hace calor 2. hace frió 3. está seco 4. voy a nadar

25. Tengo catarro:
1. estoy bien 2. estoy enfermo 3. estoy cansado 4. estoy contento

26. Juan se sienta:
1. sueño 2. en una silla 3. mal 4. perezoso

27. La profesora pasa lista. Está de pie _____ de la clase.
1. bajo 2. delante 3. fuera 4. encima

28. A mi me gusta:
1. tener hambre 2. comer carne 3. sentirme mal 4. vistiendo de azul

29. Para ser doctor se necesita:
1. ser grande 2. ser niño 3. saber leer 4. comer carne

30. La profesora siente pena de que esté enfermo un alumno. Después de expresarla, manda a los alumnos presentes que se pongan a estudiar. ¿Quién no está bien?
1. la profesora 2. un alumno 3. los alumnos presentes 4. el director

31. Unos alumnos conversan de cosas escolares, pronto cambian el curso de la conversación y hablan del calor que hace en ese momento a mediodía.
¿Que hora será?
1. Las doce de la noche 2. La una de la tarde 3. Las doce del día 4. La una de la mañana

32. Los niños son tan variables como las nubes, así como éstas cambian de forma, los niños cambian de conducta. Al momento son toda dulzura, y al instante caprichosos.
¿Cómo son las nubes?
1. variables 2. caprichosas 3. verdes 4. cambian de conducta

33. La Universidad de México es una de las mas viejas y al mismo tiempo una de las más modernas del continente. Esto quiere decir que:
1. Tiene edificios muy viejos 2. Fué fundada hace muchos años
3. Fué construida hace muchos años 4. Es una universidad mala

34. Todos se reunen a tomar juntos el desayuno porque no volverán a estar juntos durante el día hasta la hora de la cena. ¿Cuando se reunen?
1. a mediodía 2. en la mañana 3. muy tarde 4. el lunes

35. Un niño y su mamá están en casa indudablemente discutiendo lo que ocurrió durante el día cuando oyen que alguien llama a la puerta. ¿Donde están?
1. en la puerta 2. discutiendo 3. en casa 4. indudablemente

PART II

VOCABULARY TEST

DIRECTIONS: Choose the antonym (opposite) of the following:

EXAMPLE:	alegre	1. simple	2. triste	3. débil	4. dudoso
36.	buscan	1. pierden	2. necesitan	3. quieren	4. olvidan
37.	claro	1. sol	2. obscuro	3. seguro	4. oportuno
38.	curar	1. aliviar	2. sentir	3. respirar	4. enfermar
39.	despertar	1. acostarse	2. dormirse	3. levantarse	4. desayunar
40.	dudoso	1. débil	2. frío	3. seguro	4. caliente
41.	pobre	1. libre	2. carta	3. rico	4. dinero
42.	viejo	1. turista	2. joven	3. tren	4. ave
43.	nadie	1. negro	2. paso	3. algo	4. alguien
44.	olvida	1. recuerda	2. busca	3. encuentra	4. acuerda
45.	fácil	1. duro	2. pesado	3. difícil	4. débil
46.	dulzura	1. agrio	2. amargura	3. sombrio	4. ruidoso
47.	contesta	1. pregunta	2. dice	3. responde	4. quita
48.	enseña	1. estudia	2. aprende	3. muestra	4. tiene
49.	sonreir	1. alegría	2. saludo	3. feo	4. llorar
50.	van	1. llegan	2. están	3. andan	4. vienen
51.	voy	1. vengo	2. tengo	3. soy	4. doy
52.	único	1. poco	2. chico	3. muchos	4. nada

DIRECTIONS: Choose the synonym or related word.

53.	listo	1. disgusto	2. cómico	3. vivo	4. frito
54.	flores	1. pisos	2. nuevos	3. rosas	4. problemas
55.	agosto	1. lengua	2. mes	3. planta	4. noche
56.	número	1. cifra	2. ruido	3. idea	4. antojo
57.	volverán	1. vendrán	2. querran	3. regresarán	4. estudiarán
58.	tal vez	1. quizá	2. mejor	3. no hay	4. de nada

59.	se despiden	1. se acuestan	2. dicen adiós	3. se levantan	4. desayunan
60.	le mandó	1. le pidió	2. le preguntó	3. le dijo	4. le ordenó
61.	¿qué pasa?	1.¿qué quiere?	2.¿qué sucede?	3.¿qué necesita?	4.¿qué dice?
62.	siempre	1. nunca	2. sin duda	3. por supuesto	4. todo el tiempo
63.	simpática	1. fea	2. bonita	3. agradable	4. buena
64.	agradecer	1. de nada	2. dar las gracias	3. despedirse	4. saludar
65.	juego	1. producto	2. joven	3. diversión	4. canción
66.	hacer la maleta	1. empacar	2. vestirse	3. llenar	4. componer
67.	los demás	1. el resto	2. todos	3. muchos	4. algunos
68.	recién venido	1. antiguo	2. nuevo	3. pocos	4. uno
69.	sierra	1. señora	2. obra	3. montaña	4. instituto
70.	en vez de	1. después de	2. en lugar de	3. antes de	4. debajo

PART III

LISTENING COMPREHENSION TEST

DIRECTIONS: A list of sentences will be read. For each one, four answers will be suggested. Listen to each sentence, then mark on your answer sheet the number 1, 2, 3, or 4, according to whether the most likely answer is the first, second, third, or fourth one read.

71. Esta es la clase de español y ustedes son los alumnos de la clase. Qué estudian ustedes en esta clase?
   1. español
   2. inglés
   3. francés
   4. historia

72. La estación del año que más me gusta es el otoño porque entonces no hace ni calor ni frío. ¿Qué tiempo hace en el otoño?
   1. calor
   2. frío
   3. ni calor ni frío
   4. estacion del año

73. El Río Bravo que separa a México de los Estados Unidos es el más largo; el segundo en tamaño es el Santiago que desemboca en el Pacífico. Cuál es el mas largo?
   1. Santiago
   2. Pacífico
   3. Bravo
   4. México

74. A las ocho de la mañana los muchachos entran en la escuela para comenzar las clases del día. ¿En dónde entran los muchachos?
   1. en la mañana
   2. en la escuela
   3. en el día
   4. a las ocho

75. Vamos a restar. ¿Cuántos son ocho menos tres?
   1. son dos
   2. son cinco
   3. son seis
   4. son tres

76. A las tres de la tarde los muchachos salen de la escuela para volver a sus casas. ¿A donde vuelven los muchachos?
   1. a la escuela
   2. a las tres
   3. a sus casas
   4. a las clases

77. El muchacho tiene mucho sueño. Se mete en la cama para dormir.
¿Que hace el muchacho?
1. se acuesta
2. se levanta
3. se despierta
4. se viste

78. Los dos niños juegan a las canicas y dejan las lecciones para después.
¿Qué dejan los niños para después?
1. las canicas
2. el juego
3. las lecciones
4. los quehaceres

79. Un día dos muchachos andaban por el parque cuando de pronto encontraron una rana verde cerca del arroyo. ¿Dónde encontraron la rana?
1. cerca del parque
2. cerca del arroyo
3. por el parque
4. en la casa

80. Un niño le dice a su mamá que quiere comer quesadillas con una taza de café solo; su mamá le contesta que sí puede darle las quesadillas pero que no va a darle café porque es todavía muy joven para eso. ¿Qué puede darle la mamá?
1. café solo
2. quesadillas
3. de comer
4. pan con mantequilla

81. Hay en el norte de México un río llamado río Bravo. Es bien conocido por ser el que separa a Mexico de los Estados Unidos y por ser el más largo de la República Mexicana. ¿De que país se habla aquí?
1. De la República Mexicana
2. De los Estados Unidos
3. Del río Bravo
4. Del río Santiago

82. Dos niños conversan sobre los colores de las banderas de México y de los Estados Unidos. Uno de ellos dice que los colores de la de los Estados Unidos son rojo, blanco, y azúl. El otro dice que los colores de la bandera de México son verde, blanco, y rojo.
¿Cúales son los colores de la bandera de los Estados Unidos?
1. verde, blanco, y rojo
2. azúl, blanco, y verde
3. amarillo, verde, y color de rosa
4. rojo, blanco, y azúl

83. Un alumno llega tarde a clase y le dice a la profesora que ha estudiado mucho hasta le una de la mañana, y que por eso se ha levantado tarde.
¿Que excusa piensa el niño para darle a la profesora?
1. Que ha estudiado hasta la una de la mañana
2. Que está cansado
3. Que tiene hambre
4. Que tiene sueño

84. Son las cinco pero mi padre no ha vuelto a casa de su oficina. Está allí todavía trabajando. ¿Qué hace mi padre?
    1. Ha vuelto
    2. Está en casa
    3. Trabaja en su oficina
    4. Está en camino

85. Los alumnos le dicen a la profesora que están cansados, pero la opinión de ella es que no estan cansados, sino que no les gusta trabajar, que son perezosos. ¿Cuál es la opinión de la profesora?
    1. que están cansados
    2. que son perezosos
    3. que están contentos
    4. que estudian mucho

PART IV

APPLIED GRAMMAR TEST

DIRECTIONS: Read the sentence carefully; choose the word which correctly completes it. Note carefully the number or the sentence and the number of the word and mark your score sheet accordingly. A few of the sentences carry special instructions for substitution rather than completion, but the same plan of marking your score sheet is used throughout the test.

EXAMPLE: ¿Dónde está ______?
1. el perro 2. yo 3. los alumnos 4. nosotros

86. ¿Adónde van ______?
1. yo 2. ustedes 3. nosotros 4. tú

87. Vamos a ________
1. nadar 2. baile 3. silla 4. el libro

88. ¿Quién ________ María?
1. está 2. es 3. esa 4. tiene

89. Sí, conozco a ________.
1. la lección 2. el libro 3. la escuela 4. sus padres

90. ______ a Pepito.
1. compren 2. coman 3. lleven 4. bailen

91. Es la ________ de mi amigo
1. hermana 2. papá 3. perro 4. amigo

92. A mí ______ gusta la escuela.
1. ti 2. nos 3. me 4. les

93. ¿Quién es su ______?
1. libro 2. escuela 3. mesa 4. amigo

94. No, no nos ______ el libro.
1. gustan 2. gusta 3. queremos 4. tenemos

95. ¿Son nuestras ______?
1. mesas 2. libros 3. meses 4. pesos

96. Ellos ______ en la clase.
1. es 2. son 3. estan 4. está

97. Yo ______ a las ocho.
1. salgo 2. tengo 3. hago 4. he

98. Ellos ______ en México.
1. eran 2. estaban 3. iban 4. estabas

99. Es una rana. Te ______ doy.
1. lo 2. le 3. la 4. me

100. ¿Quién trae la caja? Yo la ______.
1. tengo 2. trae 3. pongo 4. traigo

101. Estoy enfermo. ______ duele la cabeza.
1. te 2. me 3. se 4. le

102. ¿Qúe ______ de comer?
1. es 2. está 3. hay 4. tengo

103. ______ duraznos, plátanos y naranjas.
1. están 2. hay 3. han 4. está

104. Puedes comer todo ______ que quieras.
1. lo 2. le 3. la 4. te

105. Ustedes la ______ dentro de una hora.
1. aprenderan 2. estudia 3. están 4. son

106. Soy de Paris. ______ en Francia.
1. Nacía 2. Nací 3. Fui nacido 4. Estuve nacido

107. Ellos me los ______ al llegar a la clase.
1. di 2. dé 3. doy 4. dieron

108. ______ Ud. lo que quiera.
1. Haga 2. Haz 3. Haces 4. Hagan

109. ______ pluma que tu tienes costó mucho.
1. Este 2. Esta 3. Está 4. Ese

110. Espero que ______ usted la bondad de complacernos.
1. tenga 2. tengan 3. tuviera 4. tendrá

DIRECTIONS: Choose the correct form for the substitution of object pronouns.

111. Le devuelve el libro a Juan.
1. Devuélveselo.
2. Se lo devuelve.
3. Le lo devuelve
4. Lo se devuelve.

112. Le da las gracias a la profesora.
1. Le las da.
2. Se la da.
3. Se las da.
4. Da se las.

113. Escriban Uds. al amigo.
1. Les lo escriban.
2. Escríbanselo.
3. Se lo escriban.
4. Escribante.

DIRECTIONS: Choose the correct negative form of the following sentences:

114. Ya viene alguien.
   1. Ya viene nadie.
   2. Ya no viene nadie.
   3. No ya viene alguien.
   4. Ya no viene nada.

115. Yo veo al niño.
   1. No yo veo al niño.
   2. Yo veo no al niño.
   3. Yo no veo al niño.
   4. No nada veo al niño.

116. Algo está dentro.
   1. No algo está dentro.
   2. Nada está dentro.
   3. Nadie está dentro.
   4. Alguien está dentro.

DIRECTIONS: Choose the correct plural form of the following sentences:

117. Voy a la escuela.
   1. Van a la escuela.
   2. Va a la escuela.
   3. Vamos a la escuela.
   4. Vas a la escuela.

118. El niño vuelve a casa.
   1. Los niños vuelvan a casa.
   2. Los niños vuelven a casas.
   3. Los niños volvemos a casa.
   4. Los niños vuelves a casa.

119. Hay un perro en la casa
   1. Hay unos perros en las casas.
   2. Han unos perros en la casa.
   3. Hay unos perros en la casa.
   4. Hay un perro en las casas.

DIRECTIONS: Choose the correct affirmative form of the following sentence:

120. No hay nada que hacer.
   1. Hay nada que hacer.
   2. Hay nadie que hacer.
   3. Hay algo que hacer.
   4. No hay algo que hacer.

SECONDARY SPANISH
LA FAMILIA FERNANDEZ
SPEAKING TEST #1

School:______________________ Student's No. _________

Directions for evaluators and administrator of the test: This portion of the test has a list of short sentences which the student is to repeat after the model.

Each statement contains one sound or sound cluster which is to be scored. The remainder of the expression should not be taken into consideration.

ADMINISTRATION:

1. Read one or two examples before starting.
2. Do not repeat example; this is a testing situation.
3. Tape only the response of the student on test items.

SCORING:

Circle the number corresponding to the student's performance.

5. EXCELLENT 4. ABOVE AVERAGE 3. AVERAGE 2. BELOW 1. POOR

Directions to be followed by the students:

Some expressions will be read aloud, with time to repeat after each expression. Listen carefully to each one and then repeat it.

		Model					
1.	(unstressed vowels)	Páseme la leche señora.	5	4	3	2	1
2.	(stressed vowels)	¿Cómo está usted?	5	4	3	2	1
3.	(stressed-unstressed vowels)	Esa niña está aquí.	5	4	3	2	1

PART II: DIRECTED UTTERANCES

ADMINISTRATION:

1. Give the students one or two examples before starting.
2. Do not repeat examples.
3. Tape only the test items and responses; do not tape explanations and examples.

SCORING:

Circle the number corresponding to the student's performance on each item, taking into consideration promptness, grammatical correctness and quality.

DIRECTIONS FOR STUDENTS:

Each of the following instructions tells you to ask or state something in the foreign language. For example, I tell you to say that you are my friend, then you say "I am your friend" in Spanish.

Samples for students:

1. Digame que Ud. es mi amigo. Yo soy su amigo.
2. Preguntele a Pepito si quiere ir Pepito, Quieres ir?

Verbs:

1. Dígame que Enrique y Ud. están aquí. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Dígame que Ud. va a Jugar con Imán. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Pregúnteme si puede ir con ellos? 5 4 3 2 1

Possessives:

1. Dígame que María es su amiga. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Dígame que el gusto es de Ud. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Dígame que las muchachas son sus amigas. 5 4 3 2 1

Prepositional Pronouns:

1. Dígame que Ud. va con nosotros. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Dígame que Ud. va conmigo. 5 4 3 2 1
3. Dígame que ellas van con Ud. 5 4 3 2 1

SECONDARY SPANISH
LA FAMILIA FERNANDEZ
SPEAKING TEST #2

School:_________________________ Student's No. __________

Directions for evaluators and administrator of the test: This portion of the test has a list of short sentences which the student is to repeat after the model.

Each statement contains one sound or sound cluster which is to be scored. The remainder of the expression should not be taken into consideration.

ADMINISTRATION:

1. Read one or two examples before starting.
2. Do not repeat example; this is a testing situation.
3. Tape only the response of the student on test items.

SCORING:

Circle the number corresponding to the student's performance.

5. EXCELLENT 4. ABOVE AVERAGE 3. AVERAGE 2. BELOW 1. POOR

Directions to be followed by the students:

Some expressions will be read aloud twice, with time to repeat after the second time. Listen carefully to each one, and then repeat it.

Example: Quiero comer carne esta tarde.

1. (r-rr) María quiere un perro y una rana. 5 4 3 2 1

2. (d) Dáme dos vasos de limonada. 5 4 3 2 1

3. (p) Para papá hay un pan. 5 4 3 2 1

PART II: DIRECTED UTTERANCES

ADMINISTRATION:

1. Give the students one or two examples before starting.
2. Do not repeat examples.
3. Tape only the test items and responses; do not tape explanations and examples.

SCORING:

Circle the number corresponding to the student's performance on each item, taking into consideration promptness, grammatical correctness, and quality.

DIRECTIONS FOR STUDENTS:

Each of the following instructions tells you to ask or state something in Spanish. For example, I tell you to say that you are my friend, then you say "I am your friend" in Spanish.

Example: Preguntele a Pepito si quiere ir. Pepito, Quieres ir?

Verbs:

1. Dígame que tiene que estar en la Universidad. 5 4 3 2 1

2. Dígame que Ud. no sabe la lección. 5 4 3 2 1

Pronouns:

3. Dígame que Ud. se llama Enrique. 5 4 3 2 1

4. Dígame que Ud. ha venido a visitarme. 5 4 3 2 1

Possessives:

5. Dígame que sus hermanas tienen que estudiar. 5 4 3 2 1

6. Dígame que mis amigos y sus amigos tienen que conocerse. 5 4 3 2 1

Prepositional Pronouns:

7. Dígame que quisiera ir con nosotros. 5 4 3 2 1

8. Dígale a Maria que los huevos son para ella. 5 4 3 2 1

SECONDARY SPANISH
LA FAMILIA FERNANDEZ
SPEAKING TEST #3

School:______________________ Student's No. __________

Directions for evaluators and administrator of the test: This portion of the test has a list of short sentences which the student is to repeat after the model.

Each statement contains one sound or sound cluster which is to be scored. The remainder of the expression should not be taken into consideration.

ADMINISTRATION:

1. Read one or two examples before starting.
2. Do not repeat example; this is a testing situation.
3. Tape only the response of the student on test items.

SCORING:

Circle the number corresponding to the student's performance.

5. EXCELLENT 4. ABOVE AVERAGE 3. AVERAGE 2. BELOW 1. POOR

Directions to be followed by students:

Some expressions will be read aloud twice with time to repeat after the second recitation. Listen carefully to each one, and then repeat after the second recitation.

1. (t) Tienen que ir por tomas. 5 4 3 2 1
2. (b) Vamos a ver al burro tambien. 5 4 3 2 1
3. (k) Cuanto cuesta la comida con carne. 5 4 3 2 1

PART II: DIRECTED UTTERANCES

ADMINISTRATION: Same as above.
SCORING: Same as above.
DIRECTIONS FOR STUDENTS:

Each of the following instructions tells you to ask or state something in Spanish. For example:

Preguntele a Pepito si quiere ir. Pepito, quieres ir?

Verbs:

1. Dígame que Ud. es buen estudiante. 5 4 3 2 1
2. Dígame que Ud. siempre dice la verdad 5 4 3 2 1

Possessives:

3. Dígame que Ud. no encuentra sus ranas. 5 4 3 2 1

4. Dígale a Pepito que para el hay un sandwich. 5 4 3 2 1

Objective Pronouns:

5. Pregúntele a Emilio si le gusta nadar. 5 4 3 2 1

6. Emilio le dice a Juan, "Déme los libros".
Dígale a Emilio que le dé los libros a Ud. 5 4 3 2 1

DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE APTITUDE TEST

The Modern Language Aptitude Test (MLAT) has been designed chiefly to provide an indication of an individual's probable degree of success in learning to speak and understand a foreign language. It is particularly useful in predicting success in learning to read, write and translate a foreign language.

PART I.	NUMBER LEARNING: This seems to measure memory and auditory alertness.
PART II.	PHONETIC SCRIPT: The ability to learn correspondences between speech sounds and orthographic symbols. Also memory for speech sounds. Ability to mimic speech sounds and sound combinations.
PART III.	SPELLING CLUES: Scores on this part depend to some extent on the student's English vocabulary knowledge. This subtest also measures the same kind of sound-symbol association ability as measured by Part II, Phonetic Script, but to a lesser extent.
PART IV.	WORDS IN SENTENCES: Student's ability to handle the grammatical aspects of a foreign language. No grammatical terminology is involved.
PART V.	PAIRED ASSOCIATES: This part measures the rote memory aspect of the learning of foreign languages.

The MLAT does not predict whether an individual can learn a foreign language if he is given enough time and opportunity to do so; what it does predict is how well he can learn a foreign language in typical foreign language courses in the usually alloted time. It will usually be necessary to develop "local" norms and expectancy tables.

The MLAT can be used for guidance purposes and diagnosis of learning difficulties as well.

Submitted December 27, 1965

/s/ Edward Campos

DESCRIPTION AND PURPOSE OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION FOREIGN LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY TESTS FOR TEACHERS AND ADVANCED STUDENTS

The MLA Foreign Language Proficiency Tests for Teachers and Advanced Students measure competence in the areas of Listening Comprehension, Speaking, Reading, Writing, Applied Linguistics, Civilization and Culture, and Professional Preparation. This seven-test battery is designed for teachers and advanced students of French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish. . . .

With the exception of the Listening Comprehension and Speaking Tests, all stimulus material and answer choices are contained in the test book. Stimulus material for the Listening Comprehension Test is recorded on magnetic tape, and answer choices are printed in the test book. Stimulus material for the Speaking Test is provided both by magnetic tape and additional material contained in the test book. Examinees taking the Speaking Test record their responses on tape. For all other tests, the examinees write their responses on separate answer materials.

APPENDIX B

MISCELLANEOUS MATERIALS PERTAINING TO THE PILOT STUDY

A. Description of Lesson Parts of La Familia Fernandez

B. Examples of Scripts of Television Classes: 2, 11, & 15

C. Samples of Materials Sent to Teachers Participating in the Project

   1. Summaries of Chapter Content La Familia Fernandez, Chapters 1, 5, 10

   2. Examples of Supplementary Substitution Drills for Chapters 11 and 14 of La Familia Fernandez

D. Observation Report Form

E. Description of Socio-Economic Background and Setting of the Three Experimental Schools

DESCRIPTION OF LESSON PARTS OF LA FAMILIA FERNANDEZ

La Familia Fernandez Spanish program is organized into six basic parts per lesson; A, B, C, D, E, and F. The function of each lesson part is explained as follows:

A. Imitacion: Using the first tape drill/exercises, you teach the basic language of the lesson by re-entry and by repetition. Longer sentences are broken into phrase groups then recombined into natural phrasing. The student first listens then imitates the sounds he hears so that he begins to think and speak Spanish from the start.

B. Preguntas Y Respuestas: The second series of exercises has been designed as a first step of "bringing the language to the student." Different questions based on the film dialogue are asked, requiring a known response. The student starts to achieve and "feel" conversational communication--a sense of security by being able through inference to give answers to questions he is asked.

C. Aplicacion: (Structure Drills) This third tape drill is supported by pictured cue sheets from the Student's Visually Cued Text. Here the student is led to a more detailed use of the language of the dialogue in greater depth, always referring back to the filmed situation as amplified by the illustrations in his visual text. Thus, danger of parroting through meaningless repetition without comprehension is minimized by the constant linking of each oral statement to a visual representation of its meaning.

D. Reconstruccion: With this next series of tape exercises, the student is oriented to third person narrative, question-and-answer dialogue related directly to but varying the structure and some of the vocabulary of the film lesson. Using the filmstrip illustrations in his visually cued text together with this tape drill enables the student to begin to tell the story with variations based on the direct dialogue.

E. Narracion: The fifth tape drill presents the narrative with a somewhat wider vocabulary than does the Reconstruccion, but always referring back to the basic film dialogue. This drill is designed to enable the student to react selectively to questioning with an automatic response--a whole sentence, a word, or phrase. He is asked to say nothing new, but he is required to be selective--one of the most important aspects of language learning.

F. Reading and Writing: This tape drill is tied to the use of the Student's Text for Reading and Writing. The basic dialogue and narrative tape exercises of prior lessons are repeated for use after the student is exposed to the written language or prior

> oral lessons. As sequential exposure to the written language follows a thorough acquaintance with the language through the sequential oral learning steps he has followed up to this point in his learning process, reading and writing skills occur naturally, almost without effort. This series of exercises is particularly valuable for dictation purposes.

The teaching plan suggested by the authors indicates that as the teacher ends part C of one lesson, he should progress to part A of the next lesson. The class is then studying parts of two lessons simultaneously. This is suggested so that the students do not become bored by working too long on one lesson.

SECONDARY SPANISH
LA FAMILIA FERNANDEZ
PROGRAM TWO

Video	Audio
Title and credits:	Theme
Amundsen	Buenos dias, maestros. Today's lesson will give major emphasis to Exercise 1B, Preguntas y Respuestas. The exercise is designed to teach three basic question forms: "What did Pepito ask?", "What did Pepito yell?" and "What did Pepito say?" The exercises are designed to help the students become aware of the questions in Part 1; then to see how the question is used in a normal situation in Part 2 and finally the question is drilled in Part 3 of Exercise 1B. In addition to the tape drill, I will drill the students and help them whenever I see that they need extra help. We will review part of Exercise 1A first. I'll have the students demonstrate what they have learned. Let's begin. ?Dónde está Karen? Aqui viene Karen.
Karen (as she comes in)	Buenos dias senor Amundsen. ?Dónde está Sally. Aqui viene Sally.
Sally (as she comes in)	Buenos dias Karen. ?Dónde está Senor Amundsen. Aqui viene Senor Amundsen.
Amundsen	Buenos dias, class. Let's begin today's lesson with a review. (Uses filmstrip and tape) 3 or 4 minutes
Amundsen	Now let's conduct a chain drill using what we have learned.

Sally	?Dónde está Karen.
Karen	?Dónde está Senor Amundsen.
Senor Amundsen	?Dónde está Sally?
Sally	?Dónde está Karen
	Aqui viene.
Karen	?Dónde está Senor Amundsen.
	Aqui viene.
Senor Amundsen	?Dónde está Sally
	Aqui viene
Sally	Dónde está Karen.
	Aqui viene Karen.
	Buenos dias Karen.
Karen	Buenos dias Sally
	?Dónde está Senor Amundsen.
	(Repeat procedures until teacher says stop)
Amundsen	Now I want you to watch the filmstrip and listen to the tape. Listen to the directions given on the tape.
Filmstrip & Tape	Exer. 1B, Part 1 (Go through 8 or 10 frames)
Amundsen	Now let's talk about what we have been doing. Do you know what they are doing? Do you have a question?
Sally & Karen	(I know or I have a question)
Amundsen	Answers questions of girls - explains three basic questions taught. If they need to do that much of the drill again, take them through again with or without the tape, but using the filmstrip.

Amundsen

Now let's go on to part 2 of the drill using the tape. The normal sequence of question and answer will be used.

Filmstrip & teacher & students

(Go through 8 to 10 items)

Amundsen

Do you think you are getting it? Now let's continue with the rest of the exercise. (Use pictures on filmstrip and tape or your voice as the model)

Amundsen

Now I would like to suggest to the teachers and classes that they review Exercise 1A, Part 3 with their students. Let the students recite the dialogue from memory.

Do all of Exercise 1B, Parts 1 & 2. Make sure your students understand.

?Qué pregunta?

?Qué grita?

?Qué dice?

Hasta Manana.

SECONDARY SPANISH
LA FAMILIA FERNANDEZ
PROGRAM #11

Content: Exercise 2E, parts 1 & 2, half way through the items, on each part.
Exercise 3B, Preguntas, parts 2 & 3.

Video	Audio
Title	Theme
Amundsen	Buenos días alumnos, buenos días maestros; Una vez mas estamos con ustedes to continue our Spanish lesson.
Sally & Karen	Buenos días, profesor, buenos días amigos. What is the lesson for today? What are we going to study today, professor?
Amundsen	Now we are going to do exercise 2E, Narracion. As the name indicates, the story is narrated to us. The student does not have to memorize this section but should be able to understand and recite it naturally. Listen and watch carefully and see how much you understand and how well you can follow the content; listen for new words.
Filmstrip #2	Tape #2, Exerc. 2E, part 1.
Amundsen at blackboard	Did you understand? Did you hear new words? 1. él 2. que 3. quiere 4. ellos 5. puede 6. irse pronto 7. también 8. ya (Illustrate the meaning of these words.) (Do not translate unless you have to.) Now we will rewind the film. I'll play a line or two of the tape and then ask you a question about what the tape said.

Amundsen working filmstrip #2	Tape 2, Exerc. 2E
	(Play one sentence on the tape and then ask girls about it. Go through 9 items.) Make a few corrections if necessary and continue showing the rest of the filmstrip. Ask the girls to repeat and tell you in Spanish some of the scenes they have just seen, showing the filmstrip by itself without the tape.
Sally & Karen	Describe or narrate what you are watching, responding alternately.
Amundsen	(Emphasize the use of el pregunta instead of Pepito pregunta, dice que, Pepito quiere ir con ellos Emilio dice que no puede. Pepito ya no quiere ir. Emilio quiere irse pronto. También quiere irse Enrique.)
	Now we are going to Exercise 3B; Preguntas. We did the first part during last class; now we are going to go on with Part 2 and Part 3.
Filmstrip #3	Tape #3, Exerc. 3B, part 2 (Do 6 items and then break).
Amundsen	I am sure you recognized these questions. I am going to turn the filmstrip back to item 1.
	Now, I want one of you to ask the questions and the other to answer. (Sally & Karen)
Filmstrip #3, Item 1	
One of the girls	?Qué grita Pepito?
Other girl	Mamá, Mamá Emilio y Enrique van a nadar.
	(Do 6 items and continue this exercise up to item 10. Repeat the same procedure. Have the girls change places. One of them ask the questions and the other answer them.)
	(Show the rest of filmstrip #3, part 2 and follow the same procedure.) (Turn filmstrip back to item 7.) (One of the girls will ask the questions and the other will answer.)
Filmstrip #3, part 2	(Continue following the same procedure until you have seen the rest of the filmstrip.)

	Using the puppets you can act out phrases and sentences.
Karen using Puppet	Mamá, mamá, Emilio y Enrique van a nadar.
Amundsen	?Qué grita Pepito?
Sally	Mamá, mamá, Emilio y Enrique van a nadar.
Sally using Puppet the mother	Bueno, Pepito.
Amundsen	?Qué dice mamá?
Karen	Bueno, Pepito.
	Etc., etc., (Teachers, this exercise will prepare your students for Prueba I, Leccion #3).
Amundsen	That is all for today, your assignment will be to practice Exercise 3B, parts 1, 2, and 3. Teachers should give test #1, Chapter 3.
	Adiós, amigos, Hasta pronto.

SECONDARY SPANISH
LA FAMILIA FERNANDEZ
PROGRAM #15

Content: Exercise #3E -
frames 11-20
Exercise #4B,
parts 2, 3
Exercise #4C,
parts 1, 2

Video	Audio
Title	Theme
Teacher	Buenos días señores, profesores y alumnos, Buenos días, señoritas. We are scheduled to work on lessons 3 and 4. Vamos a trabajar con el ejercicio #3E, primero y después continuaremos con la lección #4.
Teacher & filmstrip #3	Tape 3, Ejercicio 3E, Narracion, last part. Now I'll ask you a question after each sentence. Your teacher in the classroom can call on someone to answer the question; at the same time one of the girls here with me will answer the same question. ?Listos? Empecemos.
Teacher	?Qué dice la senora?
Karen	La señora dice "Bueno, Pepito."
Teacher	?Qué dice Pepito?
Sally	Yo no voy con ellos.
Teacher	?Qué añade Pepito?
Karen	Pepito añade: "Voy a jugar con mi perro."
Teacher	?Qué dice Amelia?
Sally	Amelia dice que viene su amiga.
	(Continue with this type of question. Be sure to use all the new words and expressions of this exercise.)

Teacher

In our previous lesson we worked on Leccion 4, Ejercicio 4A and 4B, part 1. Now let's move to Ejercicio 4B - Preguntas y Respuestas, part 3.

Filmstrip #4

Proceed as the previous lessons. Watch your visually cued text cue sheet #4, or watch the TV screen as you listen to the tape. Empecemos, y por favor, pongan mucha atencion. (Do 10 frames and ask the girls some questions to be sure they know what they are repeating.) (Continue viewing the rest of the film. Teach the question as well as the answer. In parts 2 and 3, let one girl repeat the questions and one girl repeat the answer.)

Now, we will have an exercise in the use of the expression "I am." Watch supplementary cue sheet #4A.

Supplementary cue sheet #4A

Tape 4, Ejercicio 4C, Aplicacion, part 1.

Teacher
(cue sheet on stand for camera)

Let's go through the exercise once and see what we can learn. (Please see that the camera goes on supplementary cue sheet #4 the first time through.)

(Teacher teaches this as he has the other lessons of "aplicación".) Proceed with part 2.

Now we are going to do a substitution drill using the verb ser:

Remember that the substitution drill consists of three parts: The first is a pattern that the students will repeat after the teacher's model; they will then be given a new word or a cue to be substituted at a certain place in the sentence. The students will then combine the cue with the pattern to make a second sentence and so on through the drill.

Teacher

?Listos? Empecemos.

Repeat after me.

Teacher	Student
Y yo soy Pepito.	Y yo soy Pepito.
Y yo soy Emilio.	Y yo soy Emilio.
Y yo soy Amelia.	Y yo soy Amelia.
Y yo soy María.	Y yo soy María.

Teacher		Student
Soy el hermano de Amelia.	-	Soy el hermano de Amelia.
Es el hermano de Amelia.	-	Es el hermano de Amelia.
Es el hermano de María.	-	Es el hermano de María.
Es el papá de María.	-	Es el papá de María.
Eres el papá de María.	-	Eres el papá de María.
Son los padres de María.	-	Son los padres de María.
Soy el papá de María.	-	Soy el papá de María.
Soy la mamá de María.	-	Soy la mamá de María.
El gusto es mío.		El gusto es mío.
El perro es mío.		El perro es mío.
El papa es mío.		El papa es mío.
El hermano es mío.		El hermano es mío.

Teacher

Muy bien, señoritas, estudiantes, La próxima vez continuaremos con nuestra lección, mientras tanto, estudien y practiquen los ejercicios 4B y 4C (Translate). Hasta luego, y que les vaya bien.

PUNTOS PRINCIPALES DE LAS LECCIONES
LA FAMILIA FERNÁNDEZ

LECCION #1

VERBOS:

A. Presente Indicativo de Estar:	1a. persona sing.	ESTOY
	2a. persona sing.	ESTA
	3a. persona fam.	ESTAS
B. Presente Indicativo de Venir:	2a. persona sing.	VIENE
	3a. persona sing.	VIENE

VOCABULARIO Y EXPRESIONES IDIOMATICAS

listo
Donde
aqui
Pepito
senor
Enrique
Emilio
Iman
si

Buenos dias
Vamonos

SUPLEMENTO

Que pregunta?
grita
dice
el hombre
estan
estamos
yo
tu
dime
di
digame usted.
por su perro
Llama al
saluda a

LECCION #5

VERBOS:

A. Presente Indicativo de TENER	la.	persona sing.	TENGO
		familiar	TIENES
B. Imperativo de DECIR	neg.	familiar	DIGAS

VOCABULARIO Y EXPRESIONES IDIOMATICAS

Cuantos
anos
cinco
pronto
escuela
grande
para
para
tan
Josefina
muy
gorda
eso (pron. demostrativo)
bonita
lista
igualmente
muchachas

SUPLEMENTO

conmigo
contigo
nosotras (pron. pers.)
tiene
todos se despiden
Asi
los ninos corteses
papas en Mexico.

LECCION #10

VERBOS:

A. Presente Indicativo de VENIR	3a. pers. pl.	VIENEN
B. Presente Indicativo de TRAER	3a. pers. sing.	TRAE
C. Imperativo de DEJAR	sing.	DEJAME
D. Presente Indicativo de SABER	1a. pers. sing.	SE
E. Imperativo e Infinitivo de ADIVINAR		ADIVINA
F. Presente Indicativo de VIVIR	3a. pers. sing.	VIVO
G. Infinitivo de VER		

VOCABULARIO Y EXPRESIONES IDIOMATICAS

una
caja
rana
gato
entonces
dulces
rojo
blanco
tampoco
negro
digo
verde

De que color es?

SUPLEMENTO

contestame
piensa
nuevo
cree
fin
contestan
llamando
manda
inmediayamente
saben
sabemos
que adivine
ni
ataca
repite
acierta
cosas

LECCION #11

SUBSTITUTION AND REPLACEMENT DRILLS

A.	TEACHER		STUDENT
1.	Que hacemos con la rana?	1.	Que hacemos con la rana?
2.	_______________ la caja?	2.	Que hacemos con la caja?
3.	_______________ las canicas?	3.	Que hacemos con las canicas?
4.	_______________ las lecciones?	4.	Que hacemos con las lecciones?
5.	_______________ el gato?	5.	Que hacemos con el gato?

B.	TEACHER		STUDENT
1.	La puedes poner en mi bolsillo.	1.	La puedes poner en mi bolsillo.
2.	_____________________ caja.	2.	La puedes poner en mi caja.
3.	___________________ la fuente.	3.	La puedes poner en la fuente.
4.	_____________________ aqui.	4.	La puedes poner aqui.
5.	___________________ el arroyo.	5.	La puedes poner en el arroyo.

C.	TEACHER		STUDENT
1.	Las ranas necesitan mucha agua.	1.	Las ranas necesitan mucha agua.
2.	_________ quieren ___________.	2.	Las ranas quieren mucha agua.
3.	Los ninos ___________________.	3.	Los ninos quieren mucha agua.
4.	Iman _________________________.	4.	Iman quiere mucha agua.
5.	Pepito _______________________.	5.	Pepito quiere mucha agua.

D.	TEACHER		STUDENT
1.	Donde encontraron la rana?	1.	Donde encontraron la rana?
2.	_________________ la caja?	2.	Donde encontraron la caja?
3.	__________________ las canicas?	3.	Donde encontraron las canicas?
4.	Cuando _______________________.	4.	Cuando encontraron las canicas?
5.	__________________ la rana?	5.	Cuando encontraron la rana?

E.	TEACHER		STUDENT
1.	En el arroyo cerca del parque.	1.	En el arroyo cerca del parque.
2.	_____ fuente _______________.	2.	En la fuente cerca del parque.
3.	_____ la universidad_________.	3.	En la universidad cerca del parque.
4.	_____escuela _______________.	4.	En la escuela cerca del parque.
5.	_____ el camino ____________.	5.	En el camino cerca del parque.

F.	TEACHER		STUDENT
1.	Echala en la fuente.	1.	Echala en la fuente.
2.	_________ el arroyo.	2.	Echala en el arroyo.
3.	_________ el agua.	3.	Echala en el agua.
4.	_________ el bolsillo.	4.	Echala en el bolsillo.
5.	_________ la caja.	5.	Echala en la caja.

G. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. Me das esta caja Emilio?	1. Me das esta caja Emilio?
2. Le ________________.	2. Le das esta caja Emilio?
3. _________ rana _____.	3. Le das esta rana Emilio?
4. ________ canicas ___.	4. Le das estas canicas Emilio?
5. Me ________________.	5. Me das estas canicas Emilio?

H. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. No vale nada.	1. No vale nada.
2. ________mucho.	2. No vale mucho.
3. __ quiero_______.	3. No quiero mucho.
4. __ tengo _______.	4. No tengo mucho.
5. __________nada.	5. No tengo nada.

I. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. Por que no la pones en la fuente?	1. Por que no la pones en la fuente?
2. _______________ el bolsillo?	2. Por que no la pones en el bolsillo?
3. _______________ el arroyo?	3. Por que no la pones en el arroyo?
4. _______________ la caja?	4. Por que no la pones en la caja?
5. _______________ el agua?	5. Por que no la pones en el agua?

LECCION #14

A. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. Les gusto el paseo?	1. Les gusto el paseo?
2. ________ el vestido?	2. Les gusto el vestido?
3. ________ el sombrero?	3. Les gusto el sombrero?
4. ________ la ropa?	4. Les gusto la ropa?
5. ________ el nino?	5. Les gusto el nino?

B. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. Si, senora nos gusto mucho.	1. Si senora nos gusto mucho.
2. ________ le ________.	2. Si senora le gusto mucho.
3. ________ me ________.	3. Si senora me gusto mucho.
4. ________ les ________.	4. Si senora les gusto mucho.
5. ____________ gusta ____.	5. Si senora les gusta mucho.

C. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. Mama, vi unos zapatos divinos.	1. Mama vi unos zapatos divinos.
2. __________ vestidos _____.	2. Mama vi unos vestidos divinos,
3. __________ sombreros _____.	3. Mama vi unos sombreros divinos.
4. __________ ropa __________.	4. Mama vi una ropa divina.
5. __________ casa __________.	5. Mama vi una casa divina.

D. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. A mi me gustan los sombreros que vimos.	1. A mi me gustan los sombreros que vimos.
2. _______________vestidos______ ________.	2. A mi me gustan los vestidos que vimos.
3. _______________casas _______ ________.	3. A mi me gustan las casas que que vimos.
4. _______________zapatos ______ ________.	4. A mi me gustan los zapatos que vimos.
5. _______________ ninos ______ ________.	5. A mi me gustan los ninos que vimos.

E. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. A mi me gustan los zapatos.	1. A mi me gustan los zapatos.
2. A el ________________.	2. A el le gustan los zapatos.
3. A ti ________________.	3. A ti te gustan los zapatos.
4. A nosotros __________ ______.	4. A nosotron nos gustan los zapatos.
5. A ustedes __________ ______.	5. A ustedes les gustan los zapatos.

F. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. Tal vez me compre un vestido.	1. Tal vez me compre un vestido.
2. ________________ unos zapatos.	2. Tal vez me compre unos zapatos.
3. ________________ una casa.	3. Tal vez me compre una casa.
4. ________________ un sombrero.	4. Tal vez me compre un sombrero.
5. ________________ mas ropa.	5. Tal vez me compre mas ropa.

G. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. Mama cuando vamos de compras nosotras?	1. Mama cuando vamos de compras nosotras?
2. ____________________________ ellas?	2. Mama cuando van de compras ellas?
3. ____________________________ tu?	3. Mama cuando vas de compras tu?
4. ____________________________ ustedes?	4. Mama cuando van de compras ustedes?
5. ____________________________ yo?	5. Mama cuando voy de compras yo?

H. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. Tal vez el lunes.	1. Tal vez el lunes.
2. __________ sabado.	2. Tal vez el sabado.
3. __________ miercoles.	3. Tal vez el miercoles.
4. __________ jueves.	4. Tal vez el jueves.
5. __________ martes.	5. Tal vez el martes.

I. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. Es posible que puedan ir el lunes.	1. Es posible que puedan ir el lunes.
2. Tal vez ________________________.	2. Tal vez puedan ir el lunes.
3. ________________________ el martes.	3. Tal vez puedan ir el martes.
4. ____________compren el vestido____ ________.	4. Tal vez compren el vestido el martes.
5. Es posible que ________________ ______________.	5. Es posible que compren el vestido el martes.

J. TEACHER	STUDENT
1. Mi mama y yo vamos de compras el lunes	1. Mi mama y yo vamos de compras el lunes.
2. Amelia_________________________.	2. Amelia va de compras el lunes.
3. Amelia y Emilio ________________ ____________.	3. Amelia y Emilio van de compras el lunes.
4. Yo ______________________________.	4. Yo voy de compras el lunes.
5. Tu ______________________________.	5. Tu vas de compras el lunes.

School____________________ Date____________________

Teacher____________________

OBSERVATIONAL CRITERIA FOR REACTION

Secondary Spanish -- La Familia Fernandez

1. Did the teacher have a plan and appropriate props?

2. Was the class attentive and did the children show eagerness to learn?

3. Was there evidence that each child participated:

    in the total group?
    in a small group?
    individually?

4. Was the use of English kept to a minimum?

5. Was there a correct model of speech at all times?

6. Was there evidence of immediate correction of mistakes?

7. Was there fluency of responses?

8. Did the children show mastery (memorization) of the dialogue lines?

    (a) with understanding?

    (b) with accurate pronunciation?

    (c) with grammatical correctness?

____
OBSERVER:

SOCIO-ECONOMIC BACKGROUND OF THREE EXPERIMENTAL SCHOOLS

School A

School A is located in a small town, population approximately 2,500, in the southern portion of central Utah. The main source of income of the patrons of the school is through agricultural pursuits--mostly sheep and cattle raising. The community is probably ninety-five to ninety-eight per cent Mormon. A large majority of the patrons of the school would probably be classified as middle class. The school population during the year 1965-1966 was 176 students included in grades ten, eleven and twelve.

School B

School B is located in a small town in Southern Utah of about 2,000 population. Most of the citizens of the community are engaged in occupations related to tourism; a large portion are employed by various agencies of the state of Utah such as the Department of Highways; a few of the families have small farms to supplement the family income. The socio-economic status of a majority of the families in the community would be classified as lower-class and lower-middle class. There are few professionally trained people in the town. The town is probably equally divided among Mormon and other religions.

The total school population was 214 included in grades seven through twelve.

School C

School C is located in a town of about 500 people in a remote area of Southern Utah. The town is located near a national park. The source of income for most of the citizens of the community would be from employment in Utah State Agencies such as the Department of Highways and employment in unskilled jobs in the park. Some of the families have very small farms to supplement their income. These patrons would be classified as lower-middle class. A few of the families whose children attend the school are employed by the National Park Service or the National Forest Service in positions of supervision and management. Many of these people are professionally trained and would be classified as upper-middle class. The community is probably eighty per cent Mormons and twenty per cent other religions.

School C had a student population of 151 students in grades seven through twelve during the school year 1965-1966.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Asher, James J., Sensory Interrelationships in the Automated Teaching of Foreign Languages. San Jose, Calif.: San Jose State College, 1961. 99 pp. (USOE Title VII Project No. 578, University Microfilms Pub. No. 62-2178.)

Burkhart, James A., An Experiment to Determine the Values of Using Amplified Classroom Telephone Interviews with Significant Individuals to Enrich Certain College Courses. Columbia, Missouri, Stephens College, September 1960. 44 pp. (USOE Project No. 250; University Microfilms Pub. No. 61-3612.)

Cook, H. Robert, The Effects of Learning of Structural Drills in Spanish Broadcast Via High Frequency AM Radio. Indiana University, Bloomington, 1964.

Doran, Dr. Thomas A., A Program for Coordinating the Teaching and Learning of Biology and Spanish, (OE-4-14-044), Folsom Unified School District, California, 1964.

Garry, Ralph and Mauriello, Edna, Summary of Research on "Parlons Francais": First Year Program. Boston, Mass., Modern Language Project of the Massachusetts Council for Public Schools, Inc., September 14, 1960. 56 pp. (USOE Title VII Project No. 316, University Microfilms, Pub. No. 62-2691.)

Galas, Evangeline M., The Development and Evaluation of an Elementary School Foreign Language Teaching Technique for Use by Teachers With Inadequate Knowledge of the Language Taught: A Final Report. Horace Greeley High School, Chappaqua, N. Y. 10514, December 1961.

Garry, Ralph and Mauriello, Edna, Summary of Research on "Parlons Francais": Year Two. Boston, Mass., Modern Language Project of the Massachusetts Council for Public Schools, Inc., n.d., 39 pp. (USOE Title VII Project No. 316, University Microfilms Pub. No. 63-2856.)

Gordon, Oakley J.; Engar, Keith M.; and Shupe, Donald R., Challenging the Superior Student by Making the Study of Russian Available in the Elementary School Curriculum via Television. Salt Lake City: University of Utah, 1963. 72 pp. (USOE Title VII Project No. 129, University Microfilms Pub. No. 64-750.)

Hayes, Alfred S., Language Laboratory Facilities: Technical Guide for the Selection, Purchase, Use, and Maintenance, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, Bulletin 1963. No. 37, OE-21024. Washington, D. C., Government Printing Office, 1963. 119 pp. (USOE Title VIIb Project No. 143, University Microfilm Pub. No. 64-751.)

Lado, Robert, The Meaning and Role of Culture in Foreign Language Teaching. (Conference Report.) Georgetown University, Washington, D. C. 20007, March 1961.

Leino, Walter D. and Haak, Louis A., The Teaching of Spanish in the Elementary Schools and the Effects on Achievement in Other Selected Subject Areas. St. Paul Schools, St. Paul, Minn. 55102, November 1963.

McDonald, Mrs. Pearl S., Experimental Use of Self-Instructional Courses in Russian and Spanish by Secondary School Students, (E-3-14-003), 1963. Arlington County Public Schools, Arlington, Virginia.

Nostrand, Dr. Howard Lee, Experiment in Determining Cultural Content, and Survey of Language Teaching Research, (OE-4-14-008), Board of Regents, University of Washington, Seattle, 1964.

Nostrand, Dr. Howard Lee, The Place and Nature of the Study of Culture. Seminar in Language and Language Learning. University of Washington, Seattle 98105, 1962, pp. 136-140. (Mimeo)

Scheffé, H., The Analysis of Variance, New York: Wiley Co., 1959.

Vollmer, Joseph H. and Griffiths, Ruth E., Evaluation of the Effects of Foreign Language Study in the Elementary School Upon Achievement in the High School. Somerville Public Schools, Somerville, N. J. 08876, July 1962.